

A. BRYCHKOV

---

# AMERICAN YOUTH TODAY



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS  
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Sergei Sosinsky*  
Edited by *Anatoly Bratov*

А. Брычков  
МОЛОДЕЖЬ США  
*На английском языке*

*First printing 1973*

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
A Brief History . . . . .	5
To Produce But Not To Have . . . . .	11
Equal Opportunity Without Equality and Opportunity . . . . .	21
Lost Ideals . . . . .	38
The Ivory Tower . . . . .	61
Student Power . . . . .	84
America's Shame . . . . .	114
Confrontation—Militarism VS Anti-Militarism . . . . .	128
The New Left and Other Groups . . . . .	144
Clash of Ideas and Ideologies . . . . .	186



## A BRIEF HISTORY

The history of the youth and student movement in the United States abounds in turbulent events which many a time provoked uneasiness among the ruling circles of America. One has only to remember the events of the early thirties, when thousands of young Americans took part in demonstrations by the unemployed and in marches of the hungry and poor; when a mass youth movement developed under the impact of the Sacco and Vanzetti and Scottsboro trials; and when great successes were scored through the efforts of the US Communist Party and the Young Communist League in organizing a united front of youth against war and fascism.

This united front emerged in a hard struggle with the ruling circles and monopoly capital who hoped to take advantage of the young people's urge for unity and set up an organization that would defend the interests of American capital and preserve the hold of bourgeois ideology over the younger generation.

With this in view, the First American Youth Congress was convened in August 1934, with government support and the financial backing of the big monopolies. The Young Communist League of America took part in it and, together with the Socialist Union of Youth, formed a democratic bloc which defeated the reactionary forces at the Congress and frustrated the designs of the government and the monopolies. The American Youth Congress went down in the history of the youth movement as an organization which based its activities upon a program of united struggle against war and fascism and in defense of the economic and democratic rights of the younger generation.

The Second American Youth Congress took place in July 1935 in Detroit. The overwhelming majority of the country's youth organizations representing a total of 1,350,000 young Americans took part. Despite the efforts of reactionary forces and the fact that the leadership of the American Federation of Labor would not sanction the participation of labor union youth, delegates from 150 labor unions and six central and

local labor councils were represented at the Congress. Delegates of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) also attended the Congress. The Declaration of Rights of the American Youth, adopted by the Congress, stated, in part, that in all fairness the younger generation had every right to a useful, creative and happy life guaranteed by full educational opportunities, permanent employment with adequate pay, security benefits, civil rights and peace. A bill concerning American youth was drawn up and it was resolved to launch a campaign for its adoption by the US Congress.

Considerable attention was given to the plight of the Negroes, the struggle against racial terrorism and the high unemployment among youth, which at the time had reached seven million. The participants came out in support of the young people's struggle in Cuba and colonial countries for the national independence.

The gains of progressive American youth in creating a united front were praised at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International and the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International. In his address at the opening of the Sixth YCI Congress, Georgi Dimitrov said: "We note with great pleasure that our young comrades in France and the United States have actively joined the mass movement for a united front of the youth which is so successfully developing, and have already achieved in this sphere successes which hold out great promises. All Sections of the Young Communist International should profit by this experience of the French and American comrades."

The history of the student movement in the US is equally rich in progressive democratic traditions. Between the two world wars, democratic forces held strong and leading positions in the US student movement.

Much earlier, in 1905, two prominent American writers, Jack London and Upton Sinclair, prompted by a growing student interest in socialist ideas, established an Intercollegiate Socialist Society, whose purpose, in the words of its founders, was "to create students of socialism, not to produce Socialists".

After the First World War, under the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution, an Intercollegiate Liberal

League was set up in the United States. Its influence among students grew rapidly, and in 1922, it joined forces with the National Student Committee for Arms Limitations, to become for the next six years the largest and most influential student organization in the country. In 1928, it affiliated with the League for Industrial Democracy to form what was henceforth known as the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

The crisis of 1929-33 generated a new upsurge in the democratic student movement in the US. In 1931, the Left wing of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, which was under communist influence, formed the National Student League. The latter concentrated its activities on defending students' interests and promoting their participation in the revolutionary movement. It supported militant workers' and farmers' organizations and exposed all the intrigues against the Soviet Union. The League not only led the struggle for students' academic rights, but took an active part in the social and political events of the day. In 1932 it organized the "students' invasion" of the Kentucky coal fields in solidarity with the striking coal miners. The League also organized anti-war strikes, came out against the Reserve Officers Training Corps on campus, protested against the expulsion of faculty members and students for their political views, as well as against their transfer from universities in the East to those on the West Coast, in other words, as far away as possible from the centers of the revolutionary workers' movements.

The American Establishment lost no time in setting up a counterforce to the National Student League, in the form of an organization called the National Student Federation, which adopted clearly anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist positions and took advantage of any opportunity to disunite the democratic student movement. Their attempts, however, failed. American students were more impressed by the idea of unity in the national student movement, an idea consistently advocated by the National Student League, particularly its Communist wing. The idea of unity became so popular that representatives from 200 colleges attended the student convention held in the State of Ohio at the end of 1935. This marked the beginning of the American Student Union, in which Communists, Socialists and non-aligned



students successfully cooperated for many years. The Union's program was based on such propositions as student affiliation with workers' movement, right of dissent in the classroom and in student periodicals, active protest against militarism in education and against discrimination in colleges for either racial or political reasons. This organization had several extensive campaigns to its credit: in 1936, it agitated for the "Oxford anti-war pledge"\*; in 1937, it launched a campaign for collective security; in 1938, it supported the Spanish Republicans and fought to have the arms embargo to Spain lifted; and in 1939, it conducted a protest campaign against fascism and the imperialist war. As early as April 1935, the American Student Union held a national student strike in which 184,000 students took part, and on April 20, 1939, about a million students went into the streets under the banner of "Stop Hitler!" to protest against isolationism and to voice their support for collective security. The Union consistently advocated broader cooperation between the USA and the Soviet Union.

The last major political undertaking by the Union was a vigorous protest against fascism and the fascist aggression against the Soviet Union. This was voiced at its seventh annual convention, in December 1941.

The US Establishment took advantage of the fact that the country was at war to curb the influence of progressive elements in the American student movement.

That task was made easier by the fact that the most progressive leaders of the American Student Union, being true patriots and dedicated fighters against fascism, had joined the armed forces. A split in the ranks of the Union also contributed to its downfall: the socialist contingent refused to adopt an attitude of complete and unconditional support for the Soviet Union in its struggle against Nazi Germany. As for the National Student Federation, it had actually collapsed even before 1941, due to its reactionary policies.

Taking advantage of the situation, reactionary forces proceeded to fashion a new student organization based upon

\* The name given to the resolution adopted during a debate held in the Oxford University Student Union in 1933. The resolution stated that the participants in the debate "refused to fight for King and country". The international democratic student movement considered this to be a refusal to take part in imperialist wars.

"principles" which would rule out any participation of Communists or other progressive elements. The idea was promoted that politics and partisan activity had no place in student life, and that a student organization should be "a confederation of autonomous democratic student groups". All the demagogical harping about "democracy" ended up in the exclusion of Communists from the United States Student Assembly, which was formed in May 1943. However, the attempts to create a reactionary national student organization during the war failed due to numerous progressive elements among students and their broad support of the Soviet Union's just cause.

Such an organization did, however, emerge in the postwar years, under conditions of the Cold War, hysterical anti-communism and McCarthyism. The Establishment resorted to every known device to achieve its aims in the student movement and strengthen its ideological grip upon it; it not only used blackmail and forgery and falsified facts, but turned its back on the ideals that had bound the peoples and students of countries of the anti-Hitler coalition during the Second World War.

The youth and student movement in the US entered a fairly long period of decline. The Establishment succeeded in drawing young people away from the struggle for social, economic, and political goals and in keeping students locked up in an Ivory Tower, that is, it was successful for a time in maintaining an apolitical atmosphere on US campuses, diverting students' attention from burning foreign and domestic issues and making them concentrate only on matters of a purely academic nature. The mood that overcame the young Americans of that period was such that they were subsequently labelled the silent generation.

But the silence could not last forever, for there were too many acute yet still unsolved problems that sorely affected the younger generation. At first, only a few individuals, but then a constantly growing number of young men and women became involved in democratic movements, which by the first half of the sixties assumed massive proportions. As Michael Harrington correctly pointed out in his introduction to Jack Newfield's book, *A Prophetic Minority*:

"Indeed there is a sense in which it is always the untypical few who have the verve and energy to first articulate

what is typical about their times. In the 1930's, for instance, ... the student Communists and Socialists were a relatively tiny percentage of the college population. Yet today, no one remembers the fraternity boys of the depression. Those who went into the shop to help organize the CIO, or fought in Spain, or picketed against the war are the ones who speak to history about what those times were like."

Just as in the 1930s, today's young America is personified by those young men and women who, despite all the difficulties involved, are resolutely fighting for their rights. In their struggle they encounter fierce resistance from the American bourgeoisie, which is doing everything it can to retain its control over the minds of young people. But the bourgeoisie, even with the help of the entire apparatus of repression, cannot strangle the democratic movement of youth, for their involvement is generated by acute social, economic and political problems which American capitalism is intrinsically unable to solve.

"The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy.... On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order.... Therefore, the communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political and social system." Thus reads an excerpt from a directive To All Law Enforcement Officials by former director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the late John Edgar Hoover. But in fact Communists are not the only ones who express discontent with the economic, political and social system. Such moods are characteristic of hundreds of thousands of young Americans who in the 1960s became a force in the civil rights and anti-war movements, fought for social, economic and political rights, the preservation of democratic institutions and for democratic reforms in education.

While the role of young workers in these movements is growing steadily each year, it is not surprising that Hoover should have singled out the students, for they were the first to rebel and break down the walls of silence.

## TO PRODUCE BUT NOT TO HAVE

The social significance of young people has been growing immeasurably in the postwar years: first of all, by virtue of their number alone, for nearly half of the population of the United States consists of people under 25, and the size of this age category, relative to the total population, shows a tendency toward further increase; secondly, by virtue of their increasing involvement in the country's economic life.

Young Americans occupy an essential place in the production process—in the creation of the material values of society. Yet many of them lack even elementary economic opportunities, and the political and social status of young workers is far from being commensurate with their actual role in society.

## THEY CRAVE FOR WORK

Unemployment has stalked young Americans like a shadow in the postwar years. While the national rate of unemployment is always high, the unemployment rate among young people between the ages of 16 and 24 is four or five times higher. Since the late fifties, that rate has been between 10 and 15 per cent. The rate is even higher among Negro youth, reaching 25 per cent for men and 30 per cent for women between the ages of 16 and 24.

The alarmingly high rate of unemployment among youth forced the US government—and, in particular, former President Lyndon Johnson, who demagogically predicted that the problems facing America's youth would be solved with the building of what he called the Great Society—to begin speaking in terms of the need for improvements in the education and vocational training of young people to equip them



with the knowledge and skills needed to compete in today's job market. The President's Economic Report for 1964, which came at a time when 1,500,000 Americans from 14 to 21 years of age could not find work, declared that "unemployment remains too high and will continue to be our major economic problem" in 1965. Unlike the prophesies of prosperity and broader economic opportunity in the Great Society, the above statement proved to be 100 per cent accurate.

The unemployment rate started climbing again in the beginning of 1967, when jobless young men and women under 25 years of age made up 42 per cent of the total US unemployed, as compared to 40 per cent in 1964. The continuously high unemployment rate among young people reached 15.7 per cent in June and July of 1970, the highest in six years, and exceeded 16 per cent in 1971.

These are the official statistics. But actual figures for national unemployment and unemployed youth were much higher. The official figures do not include the 10 million Americans who work part-time. Nor do they take into account the so-called "hidden unemployment", or the condition of many people who allegedly "are not actively looking for a job and therefore are not considered as unemployed". To quote the same President's Economic Report for 1964, "hidden unemployment" is concentrated among women, young males, and older men". A large proportion of the partially employed—in other words, partially unemployed—consists of young people.

Teen-agers are in a particularly difficult situation. Their education and vocational training does not allow them to apply for highly skilled work; they usually work at part-time jobs with low pay. Menial laborers, delivery boys and newsboys, farmhands, maids, servants, and baby-sitters—these are the occupations of young Americans who are forced to leave school and seek work because of their financial situation.

The problems connected with the growing number of young Americans entering the labor market have become so acute that they have aroused considerable and legitimate fears among economists, sociologists, and government officials. Back in 1963, President Kennedy drew attention to the fact that about three million teen-agers are thrown into the

labor market annually, and another million leave school to go to work without the necessary experience or training.

The annual influx of new workers into the labor market has reached enormous proportions, and it is mostly accounted for by teen-agers. American economists have estimated that this annual increase in the labor force calls for one and a half million new jobs in the United States each year. However, the actual number of new jobs created each year, according to the magazine *Fortune*, is only about 900,000.

The prospect is nearly hopeless for high school graduates and those forced to leave school who cannot find jobs. They have joined the ranks of the unemployed without even having worked and are therefore not considered by law to be unemployed.

The situation is even more desperate among young Negroes. The rate of unemployment among them is growing steadily and now ranges, depending on age, between 30 and 40 per cent, reaching 50 per cent in some states.

#### THE RIGHT TO BE DEPRIVED OF RIGHTS

The unemployment situation is not the only area in which young Americans are stripped of their social and economic rights. Even those young people who are employed find themselves in a position of inequality.

In the course of my visit to the United States, I had the opportunity of meeting in Chicago the leaders of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. During the McCarthy era, this labor union was expelled from the AFL-CIO, under the pretext of its being Communist dominated but, in reality, for its consistent struggle in defense of the rights of its members.

Before Ernest DeMaio, the local president, could answer my questions about young workers, everyone's attention was attracted by a noise coming from across the street where a crowd of people and several police cars had gathered. From time to time the police were dragging people out of a building. It turned out that the building was occupied by an unemployment insurance office and that Monday was inter-

view day. Unemployed workers must prove that they have been actually seeking work and have been unable to find it, in which case they would become eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. Judging from the way the police were dragging people out of the office, this was not such an easy process.

Against this background of an ordinary class confrontation DeMaio began his story about the status of young American workers.

When a young American gets a job, said DeMaio, he is on probation for a period of from 30 to 90 days, during which the employers can ascertain whether or not the young worker will yield profit. During this period, he has no union protection and his fate is completely in the hands of the company. On-the-job conditions are such that he has no spare time or physical strength to think about or engage in any activity other than the work itself. This probationary period is used to stifle the young worker's individuality and make him forget about his political convictions.

A young worker's skill and knowledge usually play a minor role when it comes to being promoted to a higher-paid job. Priority is given to workers with seniority, so, obviously, young workers find themselves at the bottom of promotion lists.

When taking a new job, a young person usually signs a contract which binds him hand and foot. The smallest infraction of the contract can lead, on the first occasion, to the worker's suspension from the job for several days, on the second occasion—thirty days and on the third occasion—final dismissal. This elaborate system is intended to kill any desires the workers may have to engage in social or political activities and to cultivate hostility among the workers toward any form of organizing, including labor unions. This is also helped along by the reactionary policies of the majority of the labor union bosses, who pay no attention to the problems of young workers. Labor unions often appear to young workers to be useless and extraneous because they take no resolute actions in such areas as unemployment, inadequate vocational training, poverty, the ghetto, racial discrimination, etc. Even after they have joined a labor union, young workers are often hostile to it and refuse to take an active part in its activities.

Besides this, there are objective difficulties in organizing young workers, since most of them take up inskilled jobs, either in very small or newly established businesses, or in rural areas, or are engaged as domestic help, in other words, in those spheres of employment where there are no labor unions whatever. The absence of labor union protection of course gives employers a free hand in demoting or firing any young worker they might consider "undesirable".

Also, soaring prices and taxes hit the young workers hardest, since their wages, if they rise at all, tend to rise slower than those of the older workers.

The situation is even harder for young women because women in the US receive less pay than men for the same work. This differential can range from 20 to 50 per cent, depending upon the kind of work. For example, the wages of women clerks in stores, where there is an especially high percentage of young girls, amount to only 23-25 per cent of the wages of men clerks. In 1963, the US Congress was forced to pass a law guaranteeing equal pay for women in the sales and related fields. But commercial firms easily found loopholes in the law. To make things worse, this law does not apply to women employed in rural areas, or in hotels, motels, restaurants, laundries, etc.

One of the basic causes of the decline in the standard of living of young American workers was the militarization of the economy and of all aspects of social life, due to the aggressive foreign policy pursued by US imperialism.

American propaganda made every effort to prove that increased military production and the escalation of the war in Indochina would bring about a higher standard of living, eliminate unemployment and cure all the social and economic ills plaguing American youth. The American monopolies' mouthpiece, the *Wall Street Journal*, for example, stated that increased US military operations in Asia tended to reduce unemployment by providing a great many companies with new government contracts. In addition, the draft was pulling a considerable number of young people out of the civilian labor market. In actual fact, however, US aggression in Indochina did not reduce unemployment among American youth. Moreover, to unemployment and uncertainty about the future, the war added the threat of being



sent to Vietman, Laos or Cambodia and never returning, and aggravated the social ills that trouble American youth, depriving them still further of economic and political rights.

American aggression in Indochina created additional obstacles to finding jobs for certain young people. In 1968, the number of employed in the US rose by 1,500,000, of which 575,000 were men, 875,000 women, and only 50,000 teen-agers (from 14 to 19 years of age). The insignificant influx of youth on the labor market could be explained by the war in Asia. Young men classified I-A by the draft boards had no chance of finding a job. Places of employment did not even consider their applications; thus, instead of working in factories, thousands of young Americans found themselves fighting in the jungles of Indochina.

The US Establishment even reneged on the minimum reforms it had once promised such as the building of new schools, and funds earmarked for helping children of the poor were virtually cut off. In 1966, the so-called secondary payments were sharply reduced. Included in these were allocations for milk for schoolchildren which were decreased from \$103 million to \$21 million. At the time, these reductions were described as temporary, due to the urgent need to concentrate the country's resources on the war effort in Vietnam. But the money thus obtained proved to be enough to cover the cost of only one day of war, the total cost of which was \$30 billion that year.

Such measures by the US government were not consistent with the arguments of American propagandists that increased military production could raise the American people's standard of living. They demonstrated that further militarization of the economy did not lead to a lessening of the social and economic ills besetting American youth, but only brought them into sharper focus.

American social and economic problems became so acute that on August 20, 1964, Congress enacted Public Law 88-452, known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. At the same time, a war on poverty was declared with great pomp as "one of the most urgent tasks in the years ahead", whose achievement would help build a Great Society.

This demagogical war on poverty was intended to draw the attention of the poor away from the real reasons for their difficult social and economic situation.

According to official US statistics, in 1964-65, 35 million Americans, or one-fifth of the population, were living in poverty.

Poverty within America's "affluent society" is especially telling on children and young people. Lyndon Johnson conceded as much when he declared that "the poverty of one-fifth of our families traps too many of our children in lives without opportunity or aspiration".

Various estimates put the number of children living in poverty at from 11 to 15 million, or 25 per cent of all the children in the US, and up to 23 million if teen-agers are included. Thus, young people comprise over half of those living in poverty. Within the American Negro population, those under 21 years old account for 60 per cent of the officially considered poor.

In recent years, official propaganda has been playing down the actual scope of poverty in an attempt to prove that the government's programs have resulted in reducing the numbers of the poor. However, even modest estimates show that this has not been the case. According to data published in the President's Economic Report for 1969, 6,200,000 families and 4,500,000 single persons, or a total of 30 million people, were living at poverty level.

With poverty reaching such proportions, the miserly amount of money spent each year to overcome it has produced no results. Things could hardly be otherwise when the government was spending about \$30 a year on each poor person in the country, and \$50,000 a year on each American soldier in Vietnam.

In the late fifties, a group of economists from the University of Pennsylvania estimated that an American family with an annual income of from \$3,000 to \$4,000 spent 102 per cent of that income, in other words, it could make both ends meet only by means of credit buying, and only families with an annual income of at least \$5,000 to \$6,000 could live within this income. Since then, however, prices on essential goods have risen considerably. Just between the beginning of 1966 and the end of 1967, for example, prices went up 6.4 per cent. In 1973 price growth rates are considerably higher than those at the end of the sixties.

It is not surprising therefore, that in 1968, the indebted-

ness of American consumers living on credit was \$113,000 million, most of which was owed by young workers, particularly young married couples.

#### PROMISES INSTEAD OF AID

Soon after Lyndon Johnson became President the rosy prospects of building a Great Society were outlined for American youth. A program was proposed "to insure an opportunity to every American child to develop to the full his mind and his skills". "Better education and vocational preparation of teenagers, and the reduced discrimination against minority groups," the architects of the Great Society maintained, "can significantly enlarge the employment opportunities open to any individual teenager."

In the demagogical plans for building a Great Society, and the equally demagogical "war on poverty", considerable attention was paid to the problem of unemployed youth. One attempted solution was the setting up of the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Community Action and Work-Study programs, all of which received wide publicity.

The stated aim of the Job Corps was "to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase the employability of young men and women aged 16 through 21". Detachments of the Corps were usually located in National Parks or former military camps. The young people mostly dug ditches and cleared away shrubs to earn \$30 to \$50 a month. The Job Corps provided no serious vocational training, nothing that might help them later find work in, say, the modern developing industries where jobs were most likely to be found.

According to the Community Action Program, work would be provided to young people by local authorities, schools, hospitals, and private non-commercial institutions. The project boiled down to making the young people strain their muscles in hard manual labor for \$40 a week. They were given neither vocational training nor even any general educational instruction.

The Work-Study Program was intended to provide part-time jobs to around a hundred thousand needy students so

that they could continue their studies in college. It was quite clear that the project demanded great effort on the part of the young people and could do little to contribute to any increase in the number of college students from low-income families.

The Job Corps and Community Action Program proved to be even less effective.

With 1,200,000 young men looking for jobs, in the first year of the war on poverty the government was unable to achieve its less than modest aims of getting 40,000 young men and women into the Job Corps and 200,000 into the Community Action Program. Actually, in 1965 only 22,000 young Americans were enrolled in the former and 120,000 in the latter.

The Great Society's youth employment programs were doomed to failure from the outset; instead of being planned with an eye to current conditions, they were simply borrowed from Roosevelt's New Deal programs of the 1930s. This was frankly admitted by leading American bourgeois ideologists, with the aim, however, of defending American capitalism in the eyes of the younger generation and placing all the blame for the failure of the war on poverty and the Great Society on the incompetence of President Johnson and his Administration. Former special advisor to John F. Kennedy Arthur Schlesinger Jr., for one, has written that Lyndon Johnson was "compelled by a malign fate to struggle with problems beyond his intellectual interest or control".

In reality, the fault lies not in the intellectual shortcomings of individual statesmen, but in the intrinsic inability of capitalism to provide youth with extensive economic opportunities and social and political rights.

Indeed, certain parts of the Great Society program were borrowed from the New Deal and New Frontiers. For example, the basis for the Job Corps and Community Action Program was provided by Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps in which several million young Americans worked on forestry and conservation projects and were thus excluded from the army of the unemployed. This proved ineffective in the sixties when little use could be made of unskilled labor. Only a small number of young people were given jobs, temporary at that. Nor did Johnson's program



open up any new prospects in the lives of these young Americans because it did not correspond to the modern level of the productive forces. Full employment among youth today can be achieved not by creating a limited number of new jobs, but only by providing extensive educational and vocational training that would open wide opportunities before them.

When Johnson declared his war on poverty he insisted that one of the main causes of poverty was the Cold War, which "diverted our effort to other matters" and the burdens "of preserving nuclear superiority". In effect, he admitted that the reason for poverty in the United States was the militarization of the economy and the aggressive foreign policy of American imperialism. And yet the war on poverty itself served to aid recruiting young men for the army. Desperate and disillusioned, young Americans joined the army as an escape from unemployment and slum life.

The number of men drafted annually was much greater than the number of young Americans included in the employment programs under the war on poverty. In addition, the escalation of the war inevitably led to a reduction of the already inadequate funds for the war on poverty. The annual total of these funds equalled the cost of seventeen days of the war in Vietnam, while the expenditures under the whole Community Action Program amounted to \$130 million, or as much as spent on two days of the Vietnam war.

The total failure of the war on poverty is conceded by practically all American statesmen and politicians. In 1968 the election platform of the Republican Party stated that millions of Americans were caught in the vicious circle of poverty, were destined to remain completely or partially unemployed, and the cities of America were teeming with poor people living in overcrowded slums. If elected, the Republicans promised to relieve the predicament of needy Americans. The record of President Nixon's term of office has clearly demonstrated what the Republican declarations were worth.

Youth problems—education, employment, social and political rights—still remain unresolved.

## EQUAL OPPORTUNITY WITHOUT EQUALITY AND OPPORTUNITY

It would be wrong to say that various government projects and programs fail to assign to education the place and importance it warrants under modern conditions. It is clear that life itself pushes problems of education to the fore.

The late John Kennedy said that the American economy needed more and more educated men and women and a diminishing number of unskilled workers. In recent years there has been much talk about the central aim of education being the fullest possible development of every person's potential. The people who are working now must be furnished with the knowledge adequate for coping with today's tasks, and their children must be equipped for the tasks of tomorrow.

In spite of the seeming concern for the younger generation, the reports on education which the American presidents have been presenting to Congress year in and year out since 1961 contain the selfsame figures: one out of every three fifth-grade pupils leaves school; three million American adults do not know how to read or write; 13 million have less than an eighth-grade education; and only two out of ten American young men and women receive any kind of college education.

Why is this so? In his time, dealing with the condition of the working people in Britain, Frederick Engels wrote: "Since the bourgeoisie vouchsafes them only so much of life as is absolutely necessary, we need not wonder that it bestows upon them only so much education as lies in the interests of the bourgeoisie. . . ."

Contemporary state-monopoly capitalism regards education—and, for that matter, all other spheres of social and cultural activity as well—primarily from the standpoint of its role in strengthening the private property system and

ensuring higher profits. Many American statesmen and scholars who call for improvements in education use as an argument the fact that investments in this field will ultimately result in higher profits elsewhere. John F. Kennedy, for example, pointed out that no investment could bring greater returns in the way of new products, new technology and higher wages and purchasing power than investment in education.

American economists estimate that the expansion and rising level of education are responsible for between 25 and 50 per cent of the national growth of production.

An objective result of the social and economic development of any modern society in which science increasingly becomes a direct productive force is that ever broader sections of workers are drawn into the system of education. Yet the American educational system suffers many shortcomings in this respect. Why?

Manifest in the United States is the contradiction between the requirement of modern social progress for a steady rise in the educational level of the whole population and the inevitable desire of state-monopoly capitalism to impede the education of the popular masses, especially the poorest sections.

Therein lies the class character of the American educational system. Of course, the educational level of and the educational opportunities available to the working classes in the capitalist countries have grown immeasurably, but the class nature of the bourgeois educational system has not changed despite the broader and more democratic social make-up of the students.

The class character of American schools also manifests itself in the way education is financed in the US. On the whole, 7.6 per cent of the funds for public schools come from the federal budget, 38.6 per cent from the state budget, and 53.8 per cent from local taxes.

Local taxes to finance public schools in the US take the form of a tax on individual family real estate. Essentially, however, funds derived from property taxes paid by well-to-do families are not redistributed to enhance the education of children from poorer families, since such funds go exclusively to support the schools located in the same neighborhood or school district in which they are raised. The income

level of an American family can usually be quite accurately estimated by the district in which it lives. High income families buy homes in pleasant suburban or city residential areas while the poor live in overcrowded slums. Obviously, real estate, the taxes on which provide the basis for the budget of every school, is several times higher in value in a rich suburb than in the working-class and Negro districts of a city or in areas of unemployment. The elementary and secondary school buildings in which children from families with an average annual income of less than \$5,000 are taught are, on the average, 45 years old, whereas children from families with an average annual income of \$9,000 go to the elementary schools that are, on the average, 25 years old and secondary schools that are only 10 years old.

The poor districts account for the entire 36 per cent of the country's public schools that were built more than 40 years ago, and these are the districts in which the country's entire shortage of 140,000 classrooms is found. And it is the schools of the poor districts that employ the one out of every five American teachers who has no teaching credential or has not completed the four-year college education required for such a credential.

The Establishment often blocks efforts to improve public education for the poor segments of the population. In recent years, state legislatures and the US Congress have repeatedly voted down bills providing for raises in teachers' salaries, school construction and measures to solve the problem of education in slums and certain rural areas. The overriding needs of the Pentagon are usually cited as justification for such negative action.

The foregoing facts make it clear that equal opportunity in education in the USA is an American propaganda myth. Characteristic in this respect was the admission contained in President Johnson's February 1968 Message to the Congress that the promise of equal educational opportunities for children from poor and Negro families was then still unfulfilled.

American propaganda frequently tries to justify the defects in the country's educational system by placing the blame for their existence on the working people themselves. Unemployment and poverty in the country as well as other social ills are attributed to the lack of interest in education



among youth, early marriages, lack of information about the advantages of a higher level of education, etc.

But such assertions are groundless, as indicated, for example, by the high unemployment rate among young people who are forced to leave school—18 per cent for boys and 36 per cent for girls. Of the million young Americans dropping out of school every year, about 40 per cent come from families with an annual income of less than \$3,000, that is, from poor families. For children from poor Negro families the per cent of drop-outs has gone as high as 54 per cent. Only 12 per cent of the children graduating from high school come from poor families.

The class nature of the American school system is manifested even more clearly in the discrimination practised in education. US statesmen have admitted that the Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the region or the state in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day; one-third as much chance of completing college; one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man; and twice as much chance of becoming unemployed.

While 75 per cent of the white population have a high-school education, the figure for the non-white population is only 40 per cent. Segregation also manifests itself in the fact that, even according to official statistics, in the predominantly white northern regions, \$500 are spent annually per pupil, as compared with one-third this amount in the Deep South. The youth of other minority groups—Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans—is in no better position than the Negroes. Suffice it to say that in California alone there are about 600,000 agricultural workers who have no education at all.

Thus the parents' income—in other words the dollar—is the determining factor in a child's education.

#### UNIVERSITY BARRIERS

Modern production demands from workers knowledge and skills which they lack and are unable to obtain; yet without these, their labor power loses its value and can find no ap-

plication. It turns out that the people at the bottom of the social ladder in the modern American capitalist society are poor because they are insufficiently educated, but cannot receive the necessary education because their parents are poor.

This contradiction manifests itself to an even greater degree when it comes to the question of receiving a higher education.

Modern production has an increasing need for intellectual labor. In the United States one often hears complaints that there are not enough highly skilled workers with an education of sixteen or more years, that is, a higher education. There is also a growing demand for technicians with more than a high-school education.

Obviously, this kind of worker can be provided by higher educational establishments, including the junior colleges. In 1972, the total enrolment in US universities and colleges exceeded 7,000,000.

In modern conditions, the student population cannot be made up exclusively of persons from the upper strata of American society. Objective developments force the Establishment to broaden the social base of the student body. Nevertheless, various obstacles are set up in the path of persons from the lower strata of American society aspiring to a higher education. What John F. Kennedy said in his State of the Union Address in 1961 remains true to this day: "One-third of our most promising high school graduates are financially unable to continue the development of their talents."

The school system itself clearly shows that there is no equal opportunity in access to higher education. The lower strata of American society cannot afford to send their children to private schools where the tuition fee is about \$1,000 a year. But the graduates from private schools have the best chances of entering universities.

Equal opportunities are lacking even in public schools. The theory of innate intelligence is widely used here.

In high school pupils are divided into three groups: academic, general and vocational. The selection depends largely on the financial position of the family—whether it can afford the cost of a higher education. At that moment, the future of a young man or woman is largely decided, since the academic group has much greater chances to go on to college.

No wonder, then, that at present only about one million out of the total seven million students in universities and colleges come from working-class families, which amounts to a little over 14 per cent, an extremely low figure when compared with the share of these strata in the gainfully employed population, which according to the most conservative estimates amounts to 65 per cent.

Thus the social composition of the student population alone is evidence enough of the fictitious nature of "equal opportunity" in US higher education.

Once in college, youngsters who come from the lower strata of American society are under constant pressure to drop out. Of all the students who enter college, about 40 per cent do not complete their studies, but among students from working-class families the rate is 80 to 85 per cent. Here, too, the reason lies primarily in the high cost of a university education, which, to make things worse, is growing from year to year. The average cost of a college education in the US today is close to \$4,000 a year.

Quite obviously there is little chance for young people from poor and needy families to receive a higher education. They cannot readily count on financial support from various agencies and foundations, since only 13 per cent of American students receive financial aid in the form of loans, grants and scholarships. In any case, such aid does not cover the full cost of an education.

The main reasons why many gifted young Negroes and young men and women of other minority groups cannot get a higher education are poverty, unemployment and need. Only one out of ten non-whites from 18 to 24 years of age attends a university or college, while the figure for white youth is one out of four.

But material need is not the sole factor determining the status and behavior of students in contemporary American society.

The rise of state-monopoly capitalism inevitably entails curtailment of bourgeois-democratic freedoms, limits the individual's freedom and opportunities for free and creative development. Until recently the student population in America consisted primarily of privileged young persons in terms of social origin and status. They were allowed to "play" at bourgeois democracy to a much greater degree than other

segments of the young generation. Now the situation on US campuses is characterized by a minimum of academic freedom, curtailment of elementary democratic rights of students, increasingly undemocratic university administrations, and restriction of freedom of inquiry in academic research.

Now that the social make-up of the student population has changed, state-monopoly capitalism seeks to bring all aspects of student life under its control and to shape the whole process of education in such a way as to keep the students always under the influence of the predominant US ideology. This is necessary in order to make higher education serve the aims of bringing bigger profits to the large US corporations and of fulfilling their current needs. The inclinations and interests of the student, his personality, are not taken into account. State-monopoly capitalism is not concerned about the fact that the knowledge received by students today may become obsolete in several years. Yet this is exactly what happens in many fields today. American sociologists and educators speak of a fast aging of the intellect.\*

This state of affairs was pointed out by Senator J. William Fulbright when he spoke of an erosion of "the highest function of higher education". That function may be defined as the teaching of things in perspective, towards the purposes of enriching the life of the individual, cultivating the free and inquiring mind, and advancing the effort to bring reason, justice, and humanity into the relations of men and nations.

Fulbright spoke of the moral aspects of a university education, but these are the aspects that least interest the state-monopoly circles in the US. Their viewpoint was quite clearly expressed by the former president of the University at California, Berkeley, Clark Kerr, who called the American system of education "the knowledge industry" where universities play the role of educational mills for grinding out the BA's and MA's required by all the other factories and industries or, to be more exact, to provide for the needs of the corporations.

---

\* This expression is used in the sense that knowledge gained in college becomes outdated in from 5 to 15 years (the five-year period applies, for example, in chemistry).



Among the reasons for the crisis in American higher education are anti-intellectualism, a pragmatic approach to educational goals, and the trend toward narrow specialization. Specialization may yield definite results in preparing workers to satisfy the immediate needs of a capitalist enterprise, but in the long run it is unprofitable both for society and the individual. Due to the rapid development of modern technology, the specialist, trained only ten years ago, can find himself at a dead end. Students are against excessively narrow, pragmatic specialization because under modern capitalism it represents for the engineer what mass assembly-line production meant for the worker of the first half of the century.

The pragmatic approach to education leads to the paradoxical situation where there is a surplus of specialists but not enough well educated people.

#### THE UNIVERSITY—A DOMAIN OF THE MONOPOLIES

The US ruling circles and monopolies realize quite clearly that the attitudes of today's students will determine to a large extent how faithfully tomorrow's college trained specialists will serve their interests. Unwilling to solve the real social and economic problems facing American higher education, they spare no effort to tie higher education to the system of state-monopoly capitalism and make it an appendage of the military-industrial complex.

The Establishment looks after its interests in the field of training specialists through its representatives sitting on supervisory committees, boards of regents, and boards of trustees, who have a controlling influence on all the activities and research done at higher educational institutions.

As early as the mid-forties, some liberal American university teachers complained of the close ties between universities and business and the fact that at least two-thirds of the members of the biggest universities governing bodies were persons occupying leading positions in industry, finance and commerce.

Today, higher education's dependence on monopoly capital in the United States has assumed a universal character.

Explicit facts on who dominates all facets of campus life at the University of California and Harvard University are cited in the pamphlet *Big Business and the American University* by Bettina Aptheker, a progressive student leader, and member of the US Communist Party. She estimates that the UC Board of Regents represents the interests of 68 leading banking, industrial, insurance, agricultural, commercial and mass media corporations. The financing of Harvard University is effected by 31 corporations and its general policy is determined by 76 corporations. By the example of these two universities, Bettina Aptheker concludes, it can be seen "that the *major* industrial, agricultural and banking interests of the particular region of the nation in which an institution is located, are represented on the board". The same holds true for every major university and college in the United States.

The membership of the boards of regents clearly shows the undemocratic nature of the administration of American universities. American propaganda often bestows the high-sounding title of organs of the people on these boards. Actually, the people have nothing to do with them. In the University of California, Berkeley, eight places on the board of regents automatically go to the Governor, his Deputy, the Speaker of the State Assembly, the University President and other officials. The remaining 16 regents are appointed by the Governor for a sixteen-year period. They represent the leading corporations and banks which control the economy of the West Coast of the US. Ultimately, it's they who determine the nature and content of the work of the university. Needless to say, the board of regents has no Negro or Mexican-American members, although these groups constitute one-fourth of California's population.

A similar situation exists in other US colleges. The bodies controlling universities not only do not include students but often even have no members from the faculty. Questions of curriculum and academic discipline are settled without their participation. The authority of regents and trustees is fixed in university charters. Thus, at Columbia University it is laid down that the trustees "shall forever hereafter have full power and authority to direct and prescribe the course of study and the discipline" and that the expulsion of students from the university is the province of the authorities, who

may resort to this measure "at any time on any grounds they deem advisable".

Progressive student leaders have every reason to declare that "the University of California is dominated by the men and the interests, the procedures and purposes, of American Monopoly Capital, that the real nature and causes of the agony of the American students and teachers . . . cannot be understood otherwise, and that no lasting cure for that agony can be achieved short of the complete democratization of the University and, ultimately, the destruction of that dominating power."

The influence of state-monopoly capitalism upon the activities and research carried on at American universities is growing. This process is closely linked with the increasing dependence of American universities on the military-industrial complex. A primary function of the universities is the training of personnel for corporations, institutions and agencies involved in war production. The President of Michigan State University, John Hannah, stated unequivocally: "Our colleges and universities must be regarded as bastions of our defense, as essential to the preservation of our country and our way of life as supersonic bombers, nuclear powered submarines and intercontinental ballistic missiles."

The American universities' connection with and dependence on the military-industrial complex can also be seen in the fact that about 50 per cent of all research done in many of the country's leading institutions, such as the University of California, Stanford University and the Massachusetts and California Institutes of Technology, for example, is directly related to military needs, and this includes research for perfecting weapons of mass destruction. It is known that 56 per cent of the University of California's multi-million dollar annual budget comes from government sources, primarily the Atomic Energy Commission. That budget is broken down as follows: 62 per cent for research, 12 per cent for public expenditures and only 26 per cent for student training. Almost all the money for research (56 per cent of the University's total budget) is spent on Atomic Energy Commission projects carried out by the University Radiation Laboratory—the country's leading center for military research. Thus, almost all the money received by the University from the Atomic Energy Com-

mission is used for military aims. Dr. Harold Brown, longtime director of this laboratory, who was later appointed Secretary of the Air Force by President Johnson, was one of the leading designers of the Polaris missile system.

The University faculty also includes Dr. Edward Teller, "father of the hydrogen bomb", who devotes all of his time to Atomic Energy Commission projects.

State-monopoly capitalism's dominance over US higher education has led to a situation where many universities emphasize in their research programs the study of "strategic" countries, that is, countries which are of special interest to American imperialism from a military, political or economic standpoint. Most of the money for such research comes from the military and the Central Intelligence Agency. For example, Michigan State University worked out concepts for American imperialism's aggressive policy in South Vietnam. A large group of that university's political science department were once advisors to Ngo Dinh Diem.

The government and the military in effect set the guidelines for research carried out at various kinds of international relations institutes found on university campuses. The Institute of International Studies at the University of California which devotes much of its attention to the study of the international student movement, receives most of its funds from the Department of the Air Force.

But perhaps the clearest evidence of the dependence of American universities on the military-industrial complex is the make-up of the autocratic boards of regents, trustees, supervisors, and so forth, which include executives of such corporations as General Dynamics, Lockheed Aircraft, General Electric, United Aircraft, American Telephone and Telegraph, Boeing Aircraft, General Motors and Martin Marietta.

Many universities find themselves wholly subordinated to serving the interests of such companies, as was the case with Washington State University which was compelled to concentrate its efforts on training personnel for Boeing Aircraft. The leading board positions at Harvard University have been seized by Chase Manhattan Bank, whose director and vice-president is David Rockefeller. This bank has foreign investments running into the billions, provides financial support for many US oil companies, and also holds leading



positions in Martin Marietta, one of the principal firms producing missiles and military aircraft. The interests of the Rockefeller empire are also served by Columbia University.

Senator Eugene McCarthy was wholly justified in maintaining that "the military-industrial-academic establishment in America is rapidly becoming a kind of republic within the republic".

About 80 per cent of all American scientists are employed in programs directly or indirectly connected with the military. This pertains to sociologists, psychologists, economists, philosophers and historians, as well as specialists in physics, chemistry, biology and technology.

A situation of this kind cannot but have an adverse effect on today's young scientist or scholar, who finds at the outset of his career that he has little opportunity to do research or practical work according to his own abilities, desires and inclinations. He becomes a tool of state-monopoly capitalism, which puts his knowledge to use along lines dictated by the needs of a war-oriented economy.

The US system of higher education confronts the graduating students with the unhappy choice of either yielding to the demands of state-monopoly capitalism or facing great difficulties in the labor market.

#### STUDENT OR WORKER?

The process of transforming the American university into a kind of profit-making organization has been considerably intensified due to the fast-moving developments in science and technology.

Progress in science and technology can, and actually does, promote economic growth, higher living standards, a higher level of education and culture, and the involvement of new segments of the population, especially young men and women, in production. At the same time it breeds serious economic and social problems which cannot be resolved in a capitalist society.

Not only the worker's hands, but also his brain increasingly becomes the object of capitalist exploitation. In automated plants, for example, the capitalists create conditions which

focus the worker's mind exclusively on tending his complex machine. Instead of promoting the worker's all-round mental and physical development, technological progress under capitalism often leads to serious occupational diseases resulting from mental and emotional strain. It has been estimated that 20 per cent of all illnesses among wage workers in the USA are caused by emotional strain connected with assembly-line work. Medical studies have also shown that unskilled workers are least likely to suffer from diseases of the heart.

Automation leads to increased concentration of production, further underscoring the social nature of production. But the capitalists counteract the tendency toward social unity among workers in every way possible, seeking to keep people cut off from each other both on and off the job. And this feeling of isolation is not easy to overcome. Employers put all kinds of restrictions on social and cultural activities, and most labor unions pay little attention to this problem. After work, the industrial or office worker finds himself either alone or in the small circle of his immediate family and relatives. Tired after a day's work he wants to relax, and this is where television "comes to the rescue". According to the Gallup poll, Americans spend about 70 per cent of their free time watching television, and, we might add, absorbing the same old ideas of individualism, and competition. American television programs seldom stimulate the viewer's mind. On the contrary, most of them are so conceived that the ideas presented are absorbed without thinking. As for books, the Gallup poll showed that only 17 per cent of the American people read books more or less regularly.

Another significant social consequence of scientific and technological progress is that large contingents of managerial, administrative, and technical personnel at industrial enterprises, especially the middle echelons, lose their former relatively high social and income status. A number of American economists and sociologists aptly point out that these middle categories are being transformed into a "white-collar proletariat". They correctly single out many social and economic problems brought on by scientific and technological progress which cannot be resolved in capitalist conditions. However, although their observations and assumptions may be correct, they often draw the wrong conclusions.

On the basis of their analysis of certain developments stemming from automation and scientific and technological progress, bourgeois scholars advance the notion that the class nature of modern capitalist society tends to disappear as science and technology advance. Some argue that under modern conditions, an individual's social status depends more upon the nature of his work and his income bracket than upon the class affiliation of his parents.

This approach is calculated to evade the problem of the social changes in the structure of the working class now taking place in the developed capitalist countries, above all in the US. These changes mostly have to do with the needs of modern production for more mental rather than physical labor. The trend is toward a reduction in the number of jobs available to persons without a secondary education and a simultaneous sharp increase in jobs available to people with a secondary or higher education.

There is a particularly rapid growth in the number of engineers, scientists, technicians, draftsmen and other research and professional workers.

On the basis of these changes in the structure of the working class, certain bourgeois sociologists and economists come to the conclusion that class differences are erased by scientific and technological progress, that classes disappear and that therefore there are no grounds to posit the existence of a class struggle.

The fact is, however, that class polarization is proceeding at an intensified rate. The growth in the number of specialists with a higher education working in industry and the services tends to set these people even further apart from the class of capitalists than they were previously. For one thing, monopoly capitalism can no longer afford to buy off the intelligentsia to the extent that it did in the past, simply by virtue of the tremendous growth in the size of this category of workers. The impression is fast disappearing that, because of its special status in society, the scientific and technical intelligentsia is classless. Over 90 per cent of America's intellectuals are now wage workers. Large segments of the intelligentsia, particularly those working in science and technology, are moving closer and closer to the working class in terms of their position in the system of social production, the forms and methods of their exploita-

tion, their income level and their working and living conditions. Intellectuals are increasingly subject to direct exploitation by the monopolies, which, because of the high level of development of the productive forces, are interested more in their hired workers' brains—their scientific and technical knowledge—than in their hands.

The social consequences of scientific and technological progress strongly affect the position of students. The American system of higher education is designed mainly to train young people as reinforcements for the great army of wage earners. This is a point stressed by American sociologist Horowitz in his book *Student*, where he says that the main product the student will ever have to sell is himself. His personality, his interests, his aspirations are completely ignored. As a result, students come to perceive ever more sharply the gap between the moral values of education and the values of the market on which they are destined to sell their knowledge and intellectual abilities.

Whereas previously, youngsters from working-class families who managed to acquire a higher education had a chance to rise a few rungs on the social ladder above their class and join the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie or the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, now such possibilities have been substantially narrowed. An education, even a higher education, no longer guarantees admission to the petty bourgeoisie or petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. On the contrary, the middle strata find their own previously stable position in society shaken as a result of scientific and technological progress. The situation now is that not only do young people from working-class families have, as a rule, no chance of rising "above" their class even if they have a higher education, but young people from the middle-class families are swelling the ranks of wage workers. For many of them, the university has become in effect a means of proletarianization and the place where their future class affiliation is determined.

Students of middle-class origin are beginning to realize that once they graduate from college or university they are fated to become part of an intelligentsia which is drawing closer and closer to the working class and is already the object of direct exploitation by the monopolies.

There are industrial design offices in the US of a kind



where hundreds of engineers and technicians work in one large room. Such a place is more like a factory than an office, not only in form, but in content as well. Each designer works on some specific detail and often has no idea of what contribution his work will make to the end product. His labor is similar to that of an assembly-line worker. This is the fate in store for most of today's American students.

Some Western sociologists are prone to qualify students as an exploited group. This is the viewpoint, for example, of American sociologist Paul Goodman, whose works are currently popular among students. In one of his articles, Goodman wrote: "At present in the United States, students—middle-class youths—are the major exploited class. (Negroes, small farmers, the aged are rather outcast groups; their labor is not needed and they are not wanted.) The labor of intelligent youth is needed and they are accordingly subjected to tight scheduling, speedup, and other factory methods.... It is frivolous to tell them to go elsewhere if they don't like the rules, for they have no choice but to go to college, and one factory is like another."

Of course, one can hardly agree with Goodman that students comprise a separate class, much less, "the major exploited class". There are valid grounds, however, for considering students among the exploited groups in the United States, since the very nature of the training given to future specialists is wholly determined by the needs of big corporations which finance the universities. Higher education in the US is financed primarily for the purpose of ultimately deriving profit from it and producing a commodity—called labor power—equipped with the knowledge and skills needed by the monopolies. In his book *The Uses of the University* former University of California President Clark Kerr wrote that "the production, distribution and consumption of 'knowledge' in all its forms is said to account for 29% of gross national product ... and 'knowledge' production is growing about twice the rate of the rest of the economy.... What the railroads did for the second half of the last century and the automobile did for the first half of this century may be done for the second half of this century by the knowledge industry: that is, to serve as the focal point for national growth." The rate of profit on investment in the education of the male population is quite

high surpassing 10 per cent according to the estimates of American economists. Twenty per cent of all research and development in the country is done by universities. It is obvious that not only faculty, but also students, are involved in this work, and are subjected, therefore, to direct exploitation by the monopolies that finance the research.

A growing number of American students—about 50 per cent—are forced to earn. These students gain a first-hand experience of capitalist exploitation while still in college.

An awareness that they are merely insignificant cogs in the productive process and society is causing more and more students to think about the disparity between their own interests and the interests of state-monopoly capitalism and the capitalist class. All the prerequisites are there for student youth to show a greater interest in the revolutionary theory of the proletariat—Marxism-Leninism, and for the more progressive students to go over to the political positions of the working class.

Students make extensive use of the forms and methods of working-class struggle. They stage strikes and pickets, occupy campus buildings, set up organizations resembling labor unions, etc. All this points to the existence of objective conditions for an alliance of the student movement, as part of the democratic movement of intellectuals, with the working class. As noted at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "the alliance of workers by hand and by brain is becoming an increasingly important force in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, for the democratic control of production, of cultural institutions and information media and for the development of public education in the interests of the people".

Today the prospects for such an alliance are becoming quite real in a number of developed capitalist countries, including the United States. The American Establishment is coming to realize this and is exerting increasing efforts to keep the younger generation under the influence of bourgeois ideology.

## LOST IDEALS

Political, social and economic conditions cause more and more young Americans each year to reject the values of the American way of life, and the more progressive young Americans are questioning the validity of the capitalist system itself.

The American bourgeoisie, however, has worked out a whole system of measures aimed at maintaining its control and influence on young people and distracting them from struggle. Such measures generally take into account the social and economic processes and changes taking place in the world and in the United States itself, and are adapted to new situations as they arise.

Hundreds of researchers are engaged in studying the problems of youth with the aim of developing ideas that will appeal to young people and at the same time make of them staunch defenders of capitalism. All the mass communication media and all the so-called "mass-culture" media are used to spread such conceptions, and the recommendations of bourgeois "experts" on youth are actively introduced into the activity of various pro-government youth organizations. All of this enables the ruling circles and US monopoly capital to maintain their hold on the minds of a significant portion of young Americans.

Bourgeois ideological pressure on youth takes many forms, but on the whole, three basic trends can be clearly discerned. The first is anti-communism, or blatant propaganda designed to discredit the Marxist-Leninist ideology, to persuade public opinion, by means of distortion and fact juggling, that that ideology has failed in the socialist countries, and particularly in the Soviet Union, and to convince Americans that it is in no way applicable to the United States. The apologists of capitalism who directly oppose communism belong to this trend.

The second direction is the one taken by bourgeois sociologists who argue that peaceful ideological coexistence is possible, that the modern world is pluralistic in nature and has plenty of room for the most diverse political creeds and philosophies. Characteristic of this approach is the attempt to develop an ideological system which would defend the capitalist system and, at the same time, appeal to large segments of youth. Such ideas find expression in various theories of the "welfare state", the "Great Society", "class peace", etc.

The third trend is to reject all ideology, to replace it with social instinct and individual consciousness, spread the ideas of nihilism and encourage individualism and an apolitical attitude among the youth.

The American bourgeoisie also takes advantage of the moral disintegration in evidence among part of America's youth. Bourgeois propaganda is frequently inclined to exaggerate the extent of amorality among youth in order to justify in the eyes of public opinion the repressive measures directed against all young people.

Feelings of disillusionment and disenchantment among youth are also exploited by the American ultra-Rightists, into whose demagogic net some representatives of young America get caught.

## THE AMERICAN ULTRAS AND MORAL DEGENERATION AMONG YOUTH

Unemployment, a high drop-out rate in schools, poverty, and the absence of prospects for the future, cause pessimism, cynicism, apathy, bitterness and fear for the future among young Americans. Young people, seeing no prospects, swell the ranks of the country's drug addicts, alcoholics, delinquents and criminals. Today, one rarely sees pedestrians on the streets of American cities after dark; to go into the street means to risk the chance of being murdered, even if you have but a few dollars in your pocket. On the second day of my visit to the US, when I told my American friends that I had taken a walk around Washington, D. C., the night before, their reaction was not the expected question concerning my impressions, but a warning to refrain from taking



such walks at night. And, the streets are not only unsafe at night but in the daytime as well—and even in a car. When Americans get into their cars they roll up the windows and lock the doors. I was surprised by such precautions, but they proved to be well-founded, because hold-ups in cars are a very common crime, especially when the driver is alone. You can never be sure that an armed thief will not force his way into your car at a traffic light, demand your wallet, and leave the car at the next traffic light.

Crime is increasing at a fantastic rate. In 1969, the crime rate was 11 per cent higher than in 1968. The number of arrests made was 211,343, a 20.7 per cent increase over 1968. Most of those arrested were young people. Some American writers link the growing crime rate to the aggressive war in Indochina, where Americans learn to kill, plunder and rape. It is no coincidence that the worst crimes in America are committed by former marines, since training in the Marine Corps is designed to deaden all human feelings.

Many public officials in the United States regard the problem of crime and lawlessness as more serious and dangerous to the American way of life than struggles and conflicts in other parts of the world. The following figures are cited in confirmation: in the United States a burglary is committed every 28 minutes; rape is committed every 26 minutes; a robbery takes place every 5 minutes; an assault every 3 minutes; and a car is stolen every minute.

J. Edgar Hoover himself was forced to admit that during the 1960s, the crime rate increased 12 times more rapidly than the rate of population and that there was no sign that this tendency would change in the near future. On the contrary, he felt that the statistics indicated a perilous growth of crime, particularly violent crime, in the coming decade.

More than 20,000,000 American citizens possess a total of over 100,000,000 firearms. Every year, 17,000 Americans die of gunshot wounds—an average of two every hour.

A special bill providing for measures to combat crime was introduced in the US Congress in May 1968. During the debate, it was pointed out that crime threatened to engulf America and that American citizens, constantly subjected to intimidation, terrorism and outrage, demand that an end

be put to lawlessness. But as the senators were discussing measures to be taken to fight crime, the country's newspapers, magazines, radio, television and motion pictures were spreading the gospel of violence, brutality and depravity.

American criminologists estimate that by the time an American youth is sixteen years old he has seen about 20,000 murders on TV and motion picture screens. American television presents rapists, gangsters and killers—people lacking even elementary human qualities—as models to be copied by youth.

American sociologists, psychologists and experts on juvenile problems almost unanimously agree that immorality among young people has reached unprecedented proportions. Extensive research is carried on and hundreds of books have been written dealing with problems of crime and delinquency among youth. But most writers adopt an empirical approach and make every attempt to conceal the true social, economic and political causes which are rooted in the existing system.

The contributors to a book called *The Ills of Modern Woman*, for example, look for the causes of the growth of crime, prostitution and other social vices among girls in women's emancipation which, they maintain, "has been interpreted by some women as a liberation from previous standards of propriety, morality and legality", and also in social changes which "have given them new freedoms". Nevertheless, when discussing possible ways of reducing the incidence of deviation from normal behavior among women, the authors have to conclude that much depends on whether a new and stable way of life for women will emerge in the near future.

Howard S. Becker is even more explicit. In his opinion, the reason black youths tend to deviate from traditional behavior norms is that they have no opportunity to engage in organized activity aimed at abolishing the existing social order, which is thoroughly obsolete and therefore no longer perceived by them as lawful.

But writers like Becker are rare. Most American sociologists simply ignore or purposely conceal from their readers the fact that the behavior of American youth is directly related to all the contradictions of the society in which they live. The flaws in the younger generation are a merely

hyperbolized reflection of the defects in the social system in which they develop.

Capitalism is incapable of eliminating the causes of the social ills among youth, although its proponents try to create the impression that they are greatly concerned with the problem. Hundreds of scholars are engaged in the task of elaborating some kind of positive ideals that might capture the imagination of young people.

The bourgeoisie, however, has long lost the ability to advance the kind of ideas that can serve as a source of inspiration. The truth is, say American sociologists, that the American youth today have no real ideals. This is the conclusion reached on the basis of responses made by 18,000 young men and women in a recent survey.

The crisis in bourgeois democracy opens the doors to the ultra-Rightists, whose leaders capitalize on the fact that more and more Americans are coming to realize that the two bourgeois parties are incapable of solving the social and economic problems which breed dissatisfaction among broad sections of American youth with the existing state of things.

They fan the flames of super-patriotism by playing up the tendency of some Americans, including some young people, to regard mighty America's defeats in the war against the "small and weak" Vietnamese people as an affront to American national pride, and to put the blame for these defeats on an irresolute administration and incompetency on the part of certain American generals.

The ultras also take advantage of racial prejudice existing among a certain segment of American youth. The fact that racial prejudice is a stable factor in US society was demonstrated in the 1968 presidential elections when the racist-extremist George Wallace received 13 per cent of the total vote.

In its efforts to expand its influence among American youth, reaction never tires in resorting to shoddy anti-communism and "the red threat". Fascist and semi-fascist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, the Minute-men, the Freedom Fighters, the Torchbearers of America, For America, the Citizens Councils, and Pro-America, gorge the American book market with anti-communist literature,

which tells Americans that they should adopt a wary attitude towards any democratic movement, whether it be the struggle for peace, civil rights, or for the withdrawal of American troops from Indochina, as these are all communist-front activities controlled by known Communists. The magazines *Truth*, the *Kingdom Digest* and the *Dan Smoot Report*, considered reactionary even by American standards, are published in the single city of Dallas, Texas. The Teacher Publishing Company, also located in Dallas, puts out "patriotic" books whose titles speak for themselves: *How Red Is the National Council of Churches*, *McCarthyism—the Fight for America* by Joseph McCarthy. In various parts of the country fascist and pro-fascist organizations set up "study groups" which preach anti-communism. The Freedom Fighters organization alone has 35 such groups. An even greater threat is posed by the fact that the ultras exert a decisive influence on the teaching of anti-communism in many US schools.

The danger of ultra-Rightist influence in American schools has been pointed out by many US educators. Speaking of the activities of the American Legion and other Rightist groups in schools Lawrence E. Metcalf, Professor of Education at the University of Illinois, wrote: "The result is already apparent: the offering of courses which amount to outright anti-Communist indoctrination." Another writer, Amherst Peter Shrag, stated that all the offensives of the Birchers would have amounted to nothing if major shifts had not taken place in education, that is, if courses for the study of communism from clearly Rightist positions had not been introduced. The danger is compounded by the fact that many teachers and school administrators meet the ultras halfway, and allow them to poison Americans from childhood with feelings of hate, anti-communist ideas and the spirit of the Cold War.

Campaigns to make young people read only "the right kind" of books are common in the US. Every mention of Robin Hood was deleted from school textbooks in the State of Indiana because local authorities considered that this hero of English folk ballads embraced communist ideals. In California, the reactionaries' anger was provoked by the song, *Swing the Shining Sickle*, which was included in a school textbook. The state authorities perceived this as an



allusion to the subversive "Hammer and Sickle",\* despite the fact that the song first appeared 70 years ago, and was sung by American farmers during harvest time.

About 2,000 extremist organizations exist in the United States, some with only a few members, and others with memberships running into hundreds of thousands.

The development of democratic youth movements, the increasing involvement of youth in the struggle for civil rights, the rise of anti-war feelings, and the abandonment by many young people of traditional anti-communist sentiments make the extremists' task in attracting young Americans to their side more difficult. The possibility cannot be ruled out, however, that monopoly capital may resort to fascism in a last-ditch attempt to crush the mounting democratic movement and resolve the crisis in US foreign and domestic policy.

#### IN THE SPIRIT OF AMERICANISM

Americans, like any nation, are deeply patriotic. I met dozens of young Americans who felt a mixture of pride in the achievements of the American people and deep distress because of the social and political injustices and economic inequality prevailing in the country. This kind of genuine patriotism meets with vicious opposition, and not only from the ultras. Many American sociologists and philosophers who take part in official policy-making seek to replace genuine patriotism with pseudo-patriotism in the form of bourgeois nationalism. This can be seen, for example, in the slogan of "Americanism and patriotism", which is widely propagandized, especially among youth, and is the basis of a number of sociological conceptions aimed at cultivating feelings of extreme nationalism and national superiority in the younger generation. Some leading American bourgeois scholars speak of this quite frankly. Professor of History at Yale University, Henry Steele Commager, for example, discussing the impact of the Second World War on Amer-

\* The Hammer and Sickle is the state emblem of the Soviet Union, symbolizing the alliance of workers and peasants in the socialist social system.

ican thought and character, wrote in his book *The American Mind*: "On the whole the war would seem to have confirmed those traits which we have distinguished as peculiarly American rather than to have changed them. It confirmed Americans in their optimism, their self-confidence, and their sense of superiority, for it ended, after all, in the greatest of victories and one for which they could claim a major part of the credit." American schools place great emphasis on educating children in the spirit of "Americanism and patriotism"—in the nationalistic sense of these words. Behind "Americanism and patriotism" lies a thoroughly worked out program to indoctrinate schoolchildren from the class positions of the bourgeoisie.

People like Max Rafferty, who for a number of years was California's Superintendent of Public Instruction, urge that "Americanism and patriotism" be developed from every aspect—emotional, intellectual and spiritual.

The emotional aspect consists of teaching young Americans not only to think about patriotism but to have a deep feeling about it. At first glance there would seem to be nothing wrong with this if it were not suggested that in order to achieve this aim the objective teaching of American history be abandoned. The Raffertys insist that such events in American history as the annihilation of the American Indians, slavery, the bloody reprisals against the labor movement, child labor, the aggressive wars of American imperialism, financial scandals, etc., be deleted from school textbooks. It seems that "this whole procedure, no matter how accurate in detail, adds up to a lie—and a big one".

"Balancing virtues with vices, belittling the heroes, dwelling unduly upon the scandals of the past," writes Rafferty in his book *What They Are Doing to Your Children*, "these are the techniques that produce in the minds of the children a balanced, bland, tasteless, lifeless image of their country, and all in the sacred name of objectivity. Such an image is not good enough. The boys and girls now listening to our words are, after all, the very ones who must defend within a few years all that Americans have held sacred for generations." The real truth of American history, as Rafferty sees it, is that the United States always waged war only for the sake of freedom, that it has always been and will always be the first to come to the aid of the hungry and suffering

peoples of the world, that it was the first victorious nation to reject territorial annexations, and that it is a giant among nations. "These things are true," says Rafferty. "Rightly and vividly presented, they stir the blood and arouse the finer instincts of those who hear them. Why not present them that way?"

The intellectual aspect of teaching Americanism and patriotism consists of explaining the significance of the Monroe Doctrine, presenting the fundamentals of the American free enterprise system, and illustrating the great progress made in civil rights since colonial days to the present.

The spiritual side of the question amounts to the cultivation of deep religious feelings and the belief that the United States was chosen by Providence to be "the freest country in the world".

Curiously enough, in the final analysis, the Raffertys seldom try to conceal the true aims of the conceptions they advance. They concede that Americanism could turn into chauvinism, and that love of country could become narrow nationalism. However, Rafferty says that there is nothing to fear in this, since similar dangers exist in all spheres—"science can become atheism, art can become pornography, history lends itself to propaganda. Yet none of these dangers seem to alarm us unduly. Only the twin sisters—Religion and Patriotism—have been singled out among all the rest and haled before the bar of critical 'avant-garde' opinion."

The entire concept of instructing youth in the spirit of Americanism and patriotism is saturated with anti-communism. Its authors constantly warn that children must be taught to resist the evils that await them in the modern world. These "evils" consist of the democratic movement, the fight for freedom and equality, the so-called red threat, the national liberation movement and, of course, socialism.

"Americanism and patriotism", connected in one way or another with anti-communism, underlie the activities of many American youth organizations. These include such national organizations as the Boys' Clubs of America, with a membership of 600,000 boys from 10 to 20 years of age; the Boy Scouts of America who, together with the older Explorers, number over five million; the Camp Fire Girls and the Horizon Clubs for older girls; the Girls' Clubs of

America, numbering 50,000 girls from 7 to 18 years of age; the Girl Scouts, numbering 3,500,000; and the Police Athletic League of New York, with 100,000 boys and girls from 7 to 21 years of age.

New members are attracted to these organizations by various means, including fascinating rituals, the opportunity to engage in one's favorite hobby, various sports activities, hiking and camping, and finally aid to older members in securing jobs. The New York Police Athletic League, for instance, finds about 2,500 jobs a year for its members. Such are the surface features behind which are concealed systematic efforts to keep the younger generation under bourgeois ideological influence. Suffice it to say in this connection that members of the organizations mentioned above were extensively enlisted to collect money for the Hungarian and Cuban counter-revolutionaries, and have taken part in projects sponsored by American Zionist organizations supporting the Israeli aggressors. This is how young Americans are encouraged to fight against the "evils" in today's world about which the champions of Americanism and patriotism keep harping.

Americanism and patriotism also found concrete expression in the establishment and activity of the Peace Corps. From its inception, the Peace Corps was supported not only by the government, but also by the CIA, the Army, the AFL-CIO, independent labor unions, and pro-government youth organizations. Service in the Peace Corps is regarded as service in the armed forces. Many labor unions include in their standard contract terms the provision that service in the Peace Corps is to be regarded as a valid reason for extended leave. And many union leaders actively recruit volunteers for the Peace Corps from among young workers.

This concern for the Peace Corps is explained by the fact that, among other things, it was conceived as a way to distract young Americans from the crisis within the United States, to propagate the American way of life in developing countries, and to develop in young Americans a sense of patriotism and pride in their country for generously sharing with other countries its experience, know-how, skilled personnel and material resources. In the beginning, many young Americans joined the Peace Corps sincerely believing in the



aims of the organization as officially declared in a special Act of Congress.

Those idealistic-minded young men and women found themselves deceived. American imperialism used their noble impulses and their desire to help in the economic and social development of Third World countries as a cover for its own subversive activities there. The Peace Corps became notorious in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as an instrument of US economic and political expansion and as a screen for the activities of US intelligence services.

The Peace Corps is officially an agency under the US State Department. But its real master is obviously the Central Intelligence Agency. CIA agents, doubling as Peace Corps personnel, have been exposed and expelled from many countries. In 1969, the Chilean parliament made public a secret directive from the Corps leadership instructing its members serving in Chile to collect information on that country's industrial potential, financial situation, political development and Leftist activity. The present chief of the Peace Corps, Joseph Blatchford, came to the Nixon Administration from Acción Internacional, an organization whose Latin American activities were financed by sources connected with the CIA. The first thing Blatchford did upon taking over the Peace Corps was to work out a new policy in accordance with which the Corps was to be reinforced by more experienced personnel capable of training local workers to handle any tasks. But can we really speak of a "new policy" and of more experienced personnel when the members of the Peace Corps have always been subjected to loyalty tests by the FBI and have had to certify that they are not members of the Communist Party? This new device is only another way of trying to conceal the true nature of the Peace Corps, which, in essence, functions as an instrument of US imperialist domination in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

#### A KEY TO THE FUTURE

The works of modern American bourgeois sociologists are replete with declarations to the effect that young people should enjoy individual freedom and freedom of choice, and

that they must have the opportunity "freely, independently and strictly on an individual basis" to develop their own point of view on social and political problems and form their own attitude to society and its values. But these declarations only serve as a cover for the systematic education of youth in the spirit of bourgeois ideology.

The American bourgeoisie realizes that mass involvement of youth in the economic life of the country and the general political processes in today's world contribute to a more rapid development of their political and class consciousness. Young people are becoming less susceptible to bourgeois ideology and are showing a growing interest in the ideology which stands opposed to the capitalist world—the ideology of socialism. Seeing the attraction of communist ideology and the weakness of their own concepts, American ideologists have in recent years, and with the blessings of the Establishment, increasingly resorted to rejection of ideology altogether. They seek to prove that the central issues of our time "relate not to basic clashes of philosophy or ideology but to ways and means of reaching common goals", and, therefore, that the real problem to be tackled by youth is "the management of industrial society—a problem not of ideology but of administration". The idea impressed upon youth is that there is no call for ideological struggle in the United States, that in the future America will face only technical problems which will be solved by science, and that therefore, youth, as the key force in tomorrow's America, should focus their attention on science and technology, on problems of efficient economic management and administration.

This conception is based on a number of theories which are popular among American economists, sociologists and historians, among them the theories of "a single industrial society", "the stages of economic growth" and "the pluralistic nature of the modern world". In essence, all such theories boil down to a denial of the fact that, by virtue of the objective laws of social development, capitalism is doomed to extinction and is being replaced by socialism. In other words, they deny that the main content of the present era is the transition from capitalism to socialism. The proponents of these theories strive to prove that what exists in the world today is not two opposite social systems, but a single

so-called "industrial society", which includes all of the advanced industrialized countries irrespective of their social system. The only differences between these countries are those in the degree of industrialization and in the forms of management. Accepting the notion of a single type of "industrial society", George Kennan, former Ambassador to the USSR, holds out great hope that once the differences in their levels of development disappear, distinctions between socialist and capitalist countries will be erased and they will merge into a single society with a single ideology. Walt Rostow, author of the theory of the five stages of economic growth through which all countries pass in their historical development, also maintains that the differences between capitalist and socialist countries, above all between the USSR and the USA, will disappear. He predicts that this will happen when the USSR catches up with the USA technologically and economically and both countries are at the same stage of high mass consumption. Arthur Schlesinger Jr., former special advisor to President John F. Kennedy, also supports the idea of a single future for humanity, but thinks that it must come not through the struggle of the two opposite social systems but through the renunciation of such struggle. He even suggests discarding the words "capitalism" and "socialism" as no longer meaningful, since modern society is pluralistic and may hold a wide variety of economic systems, political creeds and philosophical doctrines. "With the invention of the mixed society," he writes, "pragmatism has triumphed over absolutism." In his view, peace on earth will be possible "only when the absolutists renounce their determination to make the world over in a single image. . .".

Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington, known for their anti-Soviet, anti-communist views, also embrace the idea of pluralism. They develop the idea that "ideological and political claims must be limited" and that "industrialization creates affluence" which "undermines political disciplines and ideological orthodoxy". In their opinion, this situation is also characteristic of the Soviet Union, where advances in industrialization gave rise to a large number of social groups that filled the previously existing vacuum and now exert a growing influence upon the political system. "The function of the Party," they write, "will no longer be

to impose new demands on the system itself but to play a mediating, brokerage role, comparable to that of governments and political parties in Western democracies."

A strange and contradictory picture emerges. On the one hand, the proponents of the theory of convergence seek to create the impression that the object of their concern and thought is not the preservation and strengthening of the capitalist system but the future of all humanity. On the other hand, they come out with the idea that economic progress in the socialist countries, above all in the Soviet Union, undermines "political disciplines and ideological orthodoxy". In other words, the Marxist-Leninist ideology is not withstanding the test of time. Therefore, it should be discarded.

Furthermore, since the future of mankind depends exclusively on the level of industrial development which, as the experience of the United States shows, has no direct connection with the nature of the forms of ownership, social revolutions are by no means necessary. For greater cogency, Brzezinski has elaborated his own theory of revolution which says that most revolutions of the past failed because they were directed not toward the future but toward the past, toward defending classes and social groups which had outlived themselves. This assertion is made in order to brand all current actions against the capitalist system as movements "led by people who increasingly will have no role to play in the new technocratic society".

Such arguments are aimed primarily against an acknowledgement of the leading revolutionary role of the working class and of the class struggle because, as the authors of the theory of convergence maintain, the development of contemporary society is to a greater and greater extent being determined by the technocracy.

To preach rejection of ideology and of the ideological and political competition between the two systems is to preach imperialist ideology. All the palaver about a single industrial or mixed society is actually designed to insulate the working people from the influence of Marxist-Leninist ideas, distract them from the class struggle, distort the essence of socialism, weaken the attraction of socialist ideas and belittle the achievements of the world socialist system.

It is not surprising that these theories are specially adapted



for youth in the United States, in view of the fact that in recent years young people have expressed a heightened interest in socialism and the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The theory of the end of ideology is introduced into life through the activities of various youth organizations, whose numbers grow as the bourgeoisie comes to realize that the family, religion and the school are not doing an adequate job of moulding young minds. Official US government sources explicitly state that "the preparation of the young for adult responsibilities can be valuably augmented through various kinds of youth organizations" operating immediately under various government agencies. The main task of these organizations should be to provide "guided activities" which would develop in the young "the ability to govern", to work in business and industry, and to take on the responsibilities that will be imposed on them by important and ever growing social, economic and administrative demands.

The "guided" nature of the activities of these organizations—which, incidentally, function primarily among youth from working-class families—amounts to their drawing attention away from political and ideological issues and, under the guise of preparing their members for life in a highly developed industrial society, directing their interests and desires towards technology, economics, management, business and vocational training.

Vocational and technical training occupies an important place in the activities of most American youth organizations, some of which build their entire programs around this function. The latter include the Future Farmers of America, the 4-H (Head, Heart, Hands and Health) Clubs and Junior Achievement.

The Future Farmers of America, according to the US Information Service, is a "voluntary farm youth organization designed to develop agricultural leadership, character, thrift, scholarship, co-operation, citizenship and patriotism". It has about 380,000 active members and chapters throughout the United States and Puerto Rico; its national advisor is the chief of the Agricultural Branch of the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Its members conduct farm improvement campaigns, fight natural calamities, plant trees and shrubs on school and church grounds, organize fairs, raise money for buying seed and fertilizer, learn about cattle

and plant selection, grow and sell agricultural produce, and so forth. The same kinds of activities are carried out among girls, primarily in rural areas, by the Future Homemakers of America.

The 4-H Clubs, with a membership of two million youngsters from 10 to 21 years of age, are sponsored by the US Department of Agriculture Extension Service. Members engage in land conservation and livestock breeding, work in gardens and fields, learn to sew and cook and so forth. Annual reviews of the achievements of the organization are held. The most exemplary members are awarded prizes by government agencies, farms and industrial enterprises.

Thousands of young Americans participate in the Junior Achievement program. Here they gain business experience by organizing and operating their own small companies under the guidance of advisors from business and industry. Each miniature company is operated by 15 to 20 teen-agers, who decide on what product their company will make; raise capital by selling stock; buy tools, equipment and raw materials; make the product and sell it; keep complete books; distribute company profits, etc. The Junior Achievement program was designed to acquaint young Americans, primarily from rich families, with the American free enterprise system.

Besides the organizations discussed above, there are a large number of smaller youth organizations and clubs which are also regarded by monopoly capital and the US government as a means of influencing the development of young Americans in the "proper" direction.

If one adds to this the 3,800,000 members of the American Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the 2,000,000 members of the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), the total number of American children and young men and women participating in organizations that educate the American youth in the spirit of official policy comes close to 18,000,000.

Much has been written in the United States in recent years about the growing indifference of Americans to religion. Still the church in America remains, as always, a faithful assistant of the bourgeoisie in keeping the young people under the latter's spiritual control. This work is

carried out primarily by the oldest and largest youth organizations—the YMCA and YWCA.

The traditionally high percentage of Americans attending church is a factor used to attract youth of these organizations. Although the number of people that truly believe in God is decreasing, according to a poll conducted by the American sociologist and theologian Will Herberg about 95 per cent of Americans profess one of the three main religions in the United States—Protestantism, Catholicism or Judaism. Formally, all of them believe in God, in the power of prayer and the life to come. This is due in large part to the fact that the Establishment has always considered it profitable to support and propagandize the religious aspects of Americanism. Young Americans are continually exposed to such things as stories in books and newspapers about how religious US presidents have been; the inscription "In God We Trust" on US currency; advertisements in magazines, buses, trains, airplanes and on television exhorting Americans to attend church, because "a family that prays together—stays together". All this tends to keep most Americans unconscious of the fact that the church has long lost any of the moral, spiritual or humanistic aspects it might have had and is now merely an exponent of the American way of life.

Another important factor is that the church has found a rather original approach to social and economic problems and social movements. The history of religion in the United States shows that the church, as a rule, has never openly taken part in the suppression of democratic movements from without. On the contrary, it has often participated in such movements, demoralizing them from within, smoothing over rough edges, and preventing progressive ideas from influencing their development. Essentially, the American church has never sought to stand aloof from the country's burning social and economic problems; in fact, it has often pointed out such problems, suggesting ways of solving them that would attract the attention of religious people. This applies to an even greater degree to the YMCA.

Almost from its inception the American YMCA has not functioned as a purely religious or a purely youth organization in the strict sense of these words. Pursuing the aim of winning young men and women over to the side of Jesus

Christ, the YMCA declared its policy to be "service to men, young men and boys, without regard to race, color or creed". These ideas were reflected in the National Council Statement of 1963, which declared that the YMCA aids its members "to develop self-confidence and self-respect and an appreciation of their own worth as individuals ... to grow as responsible members of their families and citizens of their communities ... to recognize the worth of all persons, and to work for interracial and intergroup understanding ... for worldwide understanding, to develop their capacities for leadership and use them responsibly in their own groups and in community life".

These widely publicized "noble" ideals cannot but attract young Americans who consciously or subconsciously yearn for participation in group activity, the opportunities for which are severely limited by the country's social, political and economic infrastructure.

Although most of its members are Protestants, the YMCA has long ceased to be a purely Protestant organization. At present, 19 per cent of its members are Catholics, 4 per cent profess Judaism and 2.5 per cent belong to other religions. These percentages more or less accord with the national totals. Sometimes new members are not even asked about their religious affiliation.

As for the age of YMCA members, 25 per cent are children under 12, 12 per cent are from 12 to 14 years of age, 11 per cent are people from 18 to 29 years of age, and 25 per cent are men over 35. The large adult membership is an important feature of the YMCA and its activity, for drawn from it are the organization's national and local leadership, its professional personnel which numbers 4,000 persons, and its 370,000 so-called voluntary leaders. Thus, there is, in effect, one professional leader for every ten YMCA members.

Close attention to each individual member of the organization and strict discipline are very characteristic of the activity of the YMCA. The YMCA carries on its work among youth from different classes and of various social origin. Young people come to the YMCA with different personal experience in such things as unemployment, poverty, segregation, etc., and hence with different attitudes toward the social and political problems facing the nation. The task of the leadership is to convince the young people that there



are equal opportunities for all in the United States and that class distinctions and antagonism are nonexistent. This, it seems, cannot be done by merely declaring that all men are equal before God, for the influence of religion increasingly takes a back seat to the influence of purely secular ideas and the impact of social, economic and political problems. On the basis of recent surveys and polls, American clergymen have come to the conclusion that in spite of the high percentage of churchgoers in the population, "when it comes to knowledge of basic biblical facts it is obvious that the religion which actually prevails among Americans today is notably lacking in authentic Christian—or Jewish—content". Only about 40 per cent of church-going Americans answered in the affirmative when asked, "Would you say your religious beliefs have any effect on your ideas of politics and business?"

The real problems facing American youth are pounding at the crucifix-adorned doors of the YMCA, forcing its leadership to acknowledge the paradox that "one of the elements of strength in the situation of the American YMCA today is its secular orientation. YMCAs are very much 'in the world' . . . a movement of the People of God in the world and for the world". This being the case, new tasks and aims must be advanced in order to continue attracting young people to the YMCA.

The organization's leaders declare that, while the YMCA assigns a primary role to the development of the individual, it must assume some of the responsibility for the changes taking place in America's social structure. The YMCA leadership feels that it must keep a close eye on the processes that are exerting a decisive influence on the status and attitudes of America's youth today. These processes are studied and analyzed so that they might be effectively taken into account when planning the everyday activities of the organization and its overall strategy and tactics.

These questions were thoroughly studied by the late Paul Limbert, who held leading posts in the American YMCA for many years and was the Secretary-General of the World Alliance of YMCAs for 11 years. In his book, *New Perspectives for the YMCA*, he wrote that the search for a program for the future must advance from "a place where there is a real confrontation between different ideologies or ways of

life", in other words, from the contradictions in American life and the actual social and political problems confronting American youth. Limbert felt that one such problem had to do with the "status of youth, their attempt to figure out their own position in society". He admitted that "from the economic standpoint young people in America are a surplus commodity". They are the ones who, during vacations or after graduating from high school, swell the ranks of the unemployed. Hence the feeling of being rejected and unwanted that many young Americans experience. The darker a person's skin the more grounds he has for this feeling. Young people find themselves "exiles" in their own country. The YMCA expertly plays upon such feelings, offering an escape from this exile in its ranks through its various activities, including sports, particularly basketball and swimming, summer camps and evening classes for self-improvement and vocational training.

All this provides a solution to a second problem, which has to do with the need felt by young Americans to be together, to overcome loneliness, and to find respite from the individualism and competition bred by the capitalist system.

The YMCA tries to counter the feeling of revulsion of many young Americans for military service by offering alternatives to the army, the most important being active participation in the Peace Corps.

The YMCA takes into account the possible undesirable consequences of the tendency toward regarding young people merely as actual or potential consumers. Realizing that too many of America's youth cannot afford to "consume" the material goods advertized as part of the American way of life, the YMCA proposes, instead, that they join in a common search for the meaning of life, which in the final analysis boils down to the "moral values" of capitalist society with an outer religious shell.

The organization devotes a good deal of attention to problems of race relations. "The current struggle in the United States centering around the rights and privileges of Negroes," wrote Limbert, "is beyond doubt the most pressing social and political problem in America today." Attempting an analysis of the factors contributing to racial discrimination, Limbert reduced them to the emotions, sentiments and

habits of the white population in the United States, completely ignoring the real causes rooted in the existing social and political system. Consequently, like other leaders of the YMCA, he was unable to suggest any solution to the racial problem in the United States except "to alter" the heart of the American. According to a YMCA commission report, "at least 23 per cent of the 1,761 Associations still practice racial segregation with respect to membership and access to facilities". The members of each association are free to shape their own policy on the racial question.

The heightened attention of both the YMCA and the YWCA leadership in recent years to the burning social and economic issues of the day has been prompted by a growing restlessness among their rank-and-file members and the participation of many members in the anti-war, civil rights and other movements. The fact that YMCA and YWCA leaders formally raise these issues and pursue a well-thought-out and flexible policy in their regard tends to create the impression that these organizations stand guard over the real interests of American youth. This accounts for their growing membership and prestige. The YMCA and YWCA leaders are more explicit in recognizing the acute problems facing American youth than the leaders of other youth organizations in the United States, and they are more inclined to take into account changes in young America's outlook when planning their organizations' extensive practical activities. But all this does not alter the nature of the YMCA and YWCA. In the final count, they always were and continue to be mass organizations through which the bourgeoisie with the aid of the church extends its ideological influence on the youth of America.

Another religious organization which is no less sensitive to the social changes taking place in the world is the American Friends Service Committee, more commonly known as the Quakers. The Committee is more concerned with international than domestic problems.

According to the organization's precepts, Quakers must everywhere and at all times seek to advance mutual understanding and "help overcome barriers of race, creed, economic status, cultural heritage and political ideology".

The aim of the Quakers is to show the validity and viability of the tenets underlying their faith by engaging in

concrete action on the most acute problems of our time. An illustration of this was the organization's critical attitude toward the US aggression in Vietnam. However the Quakers did not denounce the aggression itself; they merely followed their precept to oppose all wars and work for peace and mutual understanding in the world. This also determined the forms that Quaker opposition to the war took. In a search for an end to the tragedy, they organized programs for education in the spirit of peace to bring about a growth of public opinion in favor of changing the policy in Vietnam.

There have been instances when, in spite of threats from US authorities, Quakers sent medical supplies, bought on money they collected, to victims of the American bombings of the DRV. At the same time, the organized projects on the territory of South Vietnam to aid "refugees from Viet Cong terrorist attacks and American bombing raids". In this way the distinction between aggressor and victim of aggression was blurred.

In their activity Quakers take into account the American youth's growing interest in the Soviet Union. They were the initiators of a number of projects that have been carried out jointly with representatives of Soviet youth; they favor the exchange of youth delegations with the USSR and other socialist countries and the holding of discussions of political and social problems. Realizing the force of attraction of Marxist-Leninist ideas and the growing interest toward socialism and Marxism on the part of modern youth everywhere, including the United States, they abstain from direct attacks against these ideas. Quakers use more refined methods of struggle against Marxism. William Barton's book, *The Moral Challenge of Communism*, is of particular interest in this respect. The author welcomes a dialogue between Marxists and Christians. His book contains almost no outright attacks against Marxism and the socialist countries, except for some generalizations based on examples from the practice of the Mao group in China. Moreover, Barton seeks to make an objective analysis of certain ethical aspects of the Marxist-Leninist society and brings out the positive features and achievements of the socialist countries. However, the idea running through the entire book is that Marxism-Leninism has contributed nothing new to the world, that the



fundamental principles of this theory formed the basis of the life and morals of the Quakers long before Marx, only the Quakers have practiced and continue to practice them in more humane ways than any Marxist-Leninist society.

The conclusion to which Barton would like his readers to come after reading his book is that everything good in Marxism was borrowed, in a somewhat distorted form, from religion. Therefore, there is no point in getting involved with Marxism; it is much better to study the religious heritage, where answers to all of today's social and economic problems can be found. All in all, Barton's book provides a fine example of the theory, spread among youth by some bourgeois sociologists, about the "universality of religious consciousness".

## THE IVORY TOWER

Student youth occupy a special place in the plans and actions of monopoly capital and the US government, and also in the theories of bourgeois sociologists.

The bourgeoisie seeks to make the training of, in Lenin's words, "useful servants of the bourgeoisie, able to create profits for it without disturbing its peace and leisure", the main function of education, including higher education.

With this in mind, bourgeois ideologists devise educational theories which support the idea that during his years at the university, the student should concentrate on mastering his profession, on learning how to make money, and on becoming an "organization man", and that, consequently, he should in no way get himself involved in what is going on outside the university, especially social action and politics.

## THE "STUDENT AS SUCH"

Thus, attempts are still being made today to persuade American students to embrace the old notion of the "student as such", that is, to accept the idea that the student should lock himself up in an ivory tower, concern himself strictly with academic matters, and take no active interest whatever in the problems and events of the outside world.

This is an old bourgeois conception designed to help maintain the bourgeoisie's ideological influence over youth. As far back as 1903, Lenin ridiculed people who "with eyes thus shut, proceed to chatter about the students as such, or the students in general". He called them the false friends of youth because they "are trying to persuade the youth that they have no need to distinguish between different trends".

Much later, the bourgeois ideologists still needed the Ivory Tower, but now in order to insulate American students from the progressive ideas and democratic influences which gained growing popularity among the youth of the world under the impact of victory over fascism, the emergence after the Second World War of a number of socialist countries and the downfall of imperialism's colonial system. The advocates of an apolitical existence for youth hoped that their doctrine would help keep the student in a passive, amorphous state until monopoly capitalism made a useful servant out of him.

The essence of this conception of the apolitical "student as such" was clearly expressed in a book, *Operation University*, by Martin McLaughlin, a student leader in the United States in the late 1940s. Describing his impressions of the First World Student Congress at which the International Union of Students emerged as a vanguard organization of the progressive, democratic students of the world, McLaughlin wrote: "In a Congress of students, where apparently the emphasis would be upon scholarship, science, analytical processes, etc., and upon student problems, there was on the contrary a positive disinclination—a refusal—to define any term whatsoever. All thought was reduced to a fundamental antimony: fascism versus anti-fascism—which latter was identified with democracy. . . . The theme was that fascism needs only to be experienced; definition is unnecessary except insofar as fascism is associated with concentration camps, torture, colonial aggression and anti-Soviet propaganda." Echoing McLaughlin, one Peter Jones declared: "Fascism, however, was not the only trouble-making word. 'Unity', 'peace' and 'co-operation',—all of which remained equally vague because of the majority's refusal to spell out their meaning. . . ."

At the 1946 First World Student Congress in Prague, McLaughlin and the other reactionary student leaders, who by no coincidence made up the majority of the US delegation, were unhappy about the determination of the progressive students of the world to achieve "unity in the struggle for peace" and "unity in the struggle for a better world". They were displeased with the pledge made by the congress's delegates to fight for the eradication of the survivals of fascism in the world, and with the resolution condemning fascism, reaction and imperialism, declaring solidarity with

the students in the underdeveloped regions still struggling for independence, and calling upon all students to struggle for a better, peaceful and democratic world.

All this was a far cry from being apolitical, and naturally the forces of reaction in the United States could not tolerate further participation of American students in an international organization of this kind.

However, efforts to quash student interest in political and social issues have been futile, a fact which bourgeois ideologists cannot but take into account as they alter the coloring of their theories to somehow conceal their unchanging substance. There has been a tendency in recent years to create a Januslike image of the student. On the one hand, say the bourgeois ideologists, he is still the "student as such", but on the other hand, he is the "student citizen" or the "student as a member of society". In fact, however, efforts are still made to prevent the student from assuming a full and equal role in the affairs of society. The prevailing "theories" on the student question in the US today are based on the premise that the young college student is only *preparing* himself for assuming civic and social functions, that is, for life in society, but is by no means living that life yet. This idea is backed by various arguments, one of which is the contention that students comprise a "special category" of youth; the fact that they are temporarily in an institution of higher education supposedly makes them fundamentally different from other youth groups. Cited in corroboration of this is the tension of university life and the student's task of acquiring the maximum of necessary knowledge in an exceedingly restricted period of time. The idea continually impressed upon the student is that it is useless for him to engage in any activities other than those which will help him have a good job and a high income in the future. Every means is used to encourage individualism and competition among students. Bourgeois sociologists and propagandists maintain that the spirit of competition is more characteristic of student life than that of cooperation.

Another doctrine adopted to influence student youth ideologically is that of American exclusiveness. American students are told that their position is radically different from that of students in other countries because of the broad educational opportunities allegedly available in the US to youth



from all strata of society. This is said to account for certain specific traits of American students, above all, their indifference to politics and their disinclination to taking an active part in the life of society. All this is designed to facilitate the unhampered pursuance of a policy serving the interests of the Establishment. Lenin wrote: "Who does not know that talk about this or that institution being non-partisan is generally nothing but the humbug of the ruling classes, who want to gloss over the fact that existing institutions are already imbued, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, with a very definite political spirit?"

The truth of Lenin's proposition is confirmed by the practical activity of US student organizations which the Establishment exploits in pursuing its policies both at home and abroad. The best example is the United States National Student Association (NSA) whose leadership has for many years rather successfully veiled its purely political activity by professing an apolitical position and adherence to the concept of the "student as such".

#### THE NSA AND ITS ROLE

"What is the NSA doing for us?" This is a question frequently heard on university campuses for many years. The NSA leaders themselves have had to admit that students as a whole know very little about the organization. Another question that students ask no less frequently, especially when asked to join the NSA, was: "What good will it do me?"

The questions speak for themselves, accurately reflecting the real state of affairs. The NSA was set up from above for purposes far removed from that of serving the interests of the students, and for this reason has failed to win wide popularity among American students.

The NSA constitution defines the activities of the organization as apolitical in nature. It reads in part: "No body acting on behalf of USNSA shall participate in sectarian religious activities or partisan political activities; they shall not take part in activity which does not affect students in their role as students."

The NSA declares its official aims to be: to render services to students, to present their opinions before university

and state authorities, to represent American students abroad and to augment the education of students through various student activities which complement academic pursuits in the total program of university education. It also notes the necessity of focussing the organization's attention on questions of academic freedom, the abolishment of discrimination in education, and the raising of the intellectual and ethical standards of student life on campus. Despite numerous references to its non-political nature, the NSA constitution clearly expresses the organization's principal political aim. It clearly states that the NSA is "to foster the recognition of the rights and responsibilities of students to the school, the community, humanity, and God, and to preserve the interest and integrity of the government and Constitution of the United States of America".

On university campuses the NSA relies on the so-called student self-government bodies, which American students as a rule regard as mere appendages of the administration. This self-government reaches the limits of its power as soon as it attempts any action not sanctioned by the administration. Any initiative undertaken by a local student self-government body which the central NSA leadership considers undesirable can be blocked under a provision of the NSA constitution, which gives the annual congress the power "to invalidate by a two-thirds vote all decisions of regional and national bodies of the United States National Student Association found to be in conflict with the constitution".

The leaders of the NSA are wont to speak about working on a broad democratic basis and about the broadly representative nature of the organization, allegedly reflecting all elements of the student population. Claiming universal representation, the NSA makes itself out to be a mechanism designed merely to register the various points of view held by students. In practice, however, all the leadership's efforts are aimed at bringing students around to sharing one quite specific point of view—the Establishment point of view. In other words, the task is to educate students according to the canons of bourgeois ideology. The NSA's activities are directly controlled by Big Business and government agencies. The student leaders have been granted the right merely to devise the best ways in which to propagandize the official point of view.

The NSA does extensive publishing, but it would be futile to search through its literature for reports on concrete actions taken in the interest of American students. Everything in it is subordinated to the job of brainwashing students. Some articles try to keep students docile by declaring "that nothing would reduce the representative character of the Association so much and so quickly as political actions and decisions". This was the excuse given for the failure of the NSA leadership to take any concrete action in regard to American imperialist aggression in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic and earlier, in Korea and other countries. Other articles try in all seriousness to convince the student that not everyone has the ability for leadership in the political affairs of the nation, and not everyone who has such ability desires to develop it. But those who do are certainly better prepared to govern than those who do not. The pages of the periodicals and pamphlets put out by the NSA abound with such assertions, but they have no room for the real problems of the United States, such as unemployment among American youth, the suppression of political activity on university campuses, and so forth.

Since the NSA is after all a student organization, its leaders cannot totally ignore student sentiments or turn their backs on growing student involvement in the anti-war movement, the civil rights movement, and the struggle for genuine academic freedom. To keep from losing their influence with students altogether, the NSA leaders do from time to time support resolutions relating to certain hot political issues. But when they spoke, for example, of the need to "find a peaceful solution to the Vietnamese problem", they completely evaded the question of American imperialist aggression, and took great pains to present the aggressor and his victim in the same light.

Their position on racial discrimination in the United States is restricted to the question of segregation in education, and action consists solely of making declarations about segregation being unconstitutional and inconsistent with "human dignity", about the NSA's desire "to see segregation completely abolished", about there being "no justification for delay in the implementation of the Supreme Court decision" on this problem, etc., etc.

Even in academic or "purely student" matters, the NSA

leadership tries to skirt the major issues by arguing, for instance, that the "requirements of order and safety" may place some restriction on academic freedoms, or that "if some student seeks to destroy these freedoms for others, then forceful action by academic leaders should be taken". There would be nothing unusual about such a position were it not for the fact that the ones accused of destroying academic freedoms for others are invariably students with democratic views. Whenever the struggle for student rights becomes heated and assumes the form of demonstrations and strikes, the NSA leaders never hesitate to condemn such actions as unlawful.

The most the NSA leaders have ever done was to put forward timid requests for concessions on the part of the government or university administrations—and this only in cases where there was a real prospect that a particular student movement would assume national proportions.

The position consistently taken by the NSA leadership is enthusiastically endorsed by the US Establishment, as can be seen by the constant attention bestowed upon the organization by leading government and political figures.

It is no accident that US government officials have lauded the "achievements" of the NSA on the international scene, for the NSA has become notorious for the reactionary, pro-imperialist and pro-colonialist policies its leaders have pursued within the international student movement.

From its very inception, the Association was set the task of "providing an alternative" to communism everywhere in the student movement. In a report by the USNSA Liaison Committee, published in 1958, this task was expressed in the following way:

"The United States National Student Association is not now, nor does it appear to be in danger of becoming communist or left-dominated. On the contrary, the USNSA has spearheaded and led the mobilization of the unions of students of the free world in combating the partisan propaganda and distortion of truth fostered by the communist International Union of Students. The USNSA strives to symbolize the youth of the 'free world' to the students in those critical areas where the battle of ideas has not yet



been resolved. The USNSA, by its actions, has demonstrated that experience in democracy aids students in combating influences that would undermine or destroy it."

In the late 1940s, the NSA leadership undertook practical measures to discharge this task through its efforts to split the ranks of the International Union of Students (IUS), an organization whose consistent position was one of struggle for peace and against imperialism and colonialism. Used as a pretext for provoking the split were the revolutionary events in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, which had demonstrated the groundlessness of American imperialist hopes of returning that country to capitalism. That was when the USNSA representative in the IUS secretariat in Prague, William Ellis, called upon the national student unions of Great Britain, France, the Scandinavian countries, South America and Canada to quit the IUS (the USNSA itself was not a member of the IUS, although it had a representative in its secretariat). Such action, said Ellis, would show "our unity and faith in our principles". Through the NSA leaders, the US Establishment set about planning a new international student organization, an organization which, in the words of the then NSA president Allard Lowenstein (later to become a Democratic Party member of the US House of Representatives from the state of New York), "would oppose Communism and the IUS". In 1950, such an organization was set up. It was the International Student Conference (ISC), which the NSA leaders or, to be more precise, those who were behind them, regarded as a vehicle for pursuing their unsavory activities within the international student movement.

The role of the NSA leaders in the creation and activity of the ISC can best be judged from their own words. Thus, when the NSA presidents applied to the appropriate government agency for draft deferment for their staff, they used the following argument in support of the request: "NSA is largely responsible for the creation and maintenance of the International Student Conference, which was established in 1950 to combat the communist-controlled International Union of Students."

It should only be added that deferment is extended according to law to persons whose work provides an important contribution to the security of the country.

The NSA's place in the expansionist designs of American imperialism has long been known. But that was not the only role assigned to the NSA by the US Establishment. The exposures made in the American press in February-March 1967 showed that for many years, beginning as far back as 1950, the organization was actively used by the CIA, whose attention could not but be drawn to the fact that the NSA leaders regarded as their primary task the providing of "an alternative for communism everywhere". It was revealed that the NSA, as well as the ISC, operated primarily on CIA money, which reached it through such channels as the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs, the Independence Foundation, the San Jacinto Foundation, the Borden Trust, the Price Fund, the Edsel Fund, the Beacon Fund, the Kentfield Fund, the J. Frederick Brown Foundation and the Sidney and Esther Rabb Charitable Foundation. An interesting fact is that only the first three of the sources listed above were mentioned occasionally in the financial reports at the NSA annual congresses, whereas none of them figured in the ISC financial reports at all, since the actual amount of money received by that organization to cover its budget was never given.

With money pouring in, the NSA and ISC became more and more deeply involved in international espionage. And more and more of their leaders' thought and energy was devoted not to satisfying the urgent needs and demands of students, but to camouflaging the nature of the activities they zealously engaged in on orders from their CIA bosses.

NSA leaders, recruited by the CIA, as a rule operated either as members of delegations or tourist groups visiting foreign countries, or as NSA representatives on various international student projects, or as students or postgraduate students at foreign universities and research institutes. To procure the volume of information needed by the CIA, they had to make wide contact with foreign students and organizations, travelling when necessary from city to city and from country to country. The money required for all this came from the sources listed above. For example, the Independence Foundation established several scholarships, usually amounting to \$3,000 a year, enabling former NSA personnel to study abroad. Similar scholarships were set up by other foundations.

It would be wrong to assume that all the American students who were members of the NSA were involved in the CIA spy network. The CIA worked primarily with student leaders who occupied key posts in the organization and dealt with the NSA's international activities.

The American press named quite a few government officials who had been connected with the CIA while in the NSA leadership. These included Ralph Duncan, later to become the US Ambassador to Chile, and Douglass Cater, special advisor to President Johnson.

Other examples can be given which reveal, at the same time, the forms and methods of CIA exploitation of the NSA. Notable in this respect is the career of one Harry Lunn, who was NSA president in 1954-55. After serving as president of the organization, he spent a long time in Southeast Asia as its student representative. Then he did research at the Defense Department and later held an important post at the US Embassy in Paris. From there he went to the Agency for International Development. In 1965, he became the executive secretary of the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs. From his own past experience he knew quite well how the NSA used the money it received from the foundation he was now an official of. It was no accident, apparently, that the foundation was extremely generous with the NSA and ISC. In just the period between October 1965 and October 1966, for example, it gave the NSA \$29,000. Between 1962 and 1964, together with the San Jacinto Foundation, it financed 90 per cent of the ISC budget, which came to the tidy sum of \$1,826,000. Most of the money came from the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs. It is quite clear that without the support of this foundation the ISC would be impotent as an international organization and would simply go out of existence.

Finally, it should be noted that Lunn took an active part in the subversive activities of the Independence Research Service (IRS) at the Seventh World Youth Festival in Vienna in 1959. The IRS organized anti-festival activities both in Vienna in 1959, and in Helsinki in 1962. It recruited and shipped rowdies to the festivals to undermine the spirit of solidarity, peace and friendship which united the democratic youth of the world.

The NSA joined in these IRS activities. Although at its

congresses it passed resolutions on non-participation in the festivals, it did in fact participate in them, but on the side of those who vainly sought to wreck them. It could not be otherwise, since the NSA and IRS had the same master and the same source of money. The IRS received \$18,000 from the Independence Foundation alone to carry out anti-festival activities. There were personal contacts between the NSA and IRS as well. The director of the IRS at the time of the World Youth Festival in Helsinki was Dennis Shaul, who was shortly after elected NSA president. In 1964, he was awarded a scholarship for study abroad by the same Independence Foundation. All this leaves little doubt as to Dennis Shaul's connections with the CIA.

Another NSA president with an interesting list of subsequent occupations was James Harris. In 1949, when his term as NSA president expired, he went to work in the World University Service, an organization which under the cover of its philanthropic activities supported a reactionary, splitting policy in the international student movement. Following this upon receiving a scholarship for study in Cairo, he spent some time "representing the interests" of the NSA in Africa. Then, in 1956, he became director of an NSA project called the Foreign Student Leadership Program, whose aim was to invite students from Asian, African and Latin American countries to come to the United States for the kind of "training" that would make of them faithful US imperialist policy-makers. The Ford Foundation provided \$128,000 for this program at its initial stage. The NSA leadership preferred to keep quiet about the other sources of money for the program. What aims of the Foreign Student Leadership Program were could be seen from students selected for participation. With the help of US Embassy personnel and NSA "student" representatives in the various countries, participatives were carefully selected on the spot from among the local reactionary student leaders.

Many other examples could be cited which show that the NSA, in keeping with the desires of its CIA bosses, paid special attention to "those critical areas where the battle of ideas has not yet been resolved" or, to be more precise, to those student leaders in the Asian, African and Latin American countries who could be bribed to act against the national interests of their native country and against the inter-



rests of the great mass of its students. The NSA supplemented the Foreign Student Leadership Program by sending numerous NSA delegations primarily to those countries which formed the bulwark of the reactionary, aggressive policy of American imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, or where the aims of that policy were threatened by the national liberation movement. Frequent visits by the emissaries of American imperialism from the NSA were made to such places as South Vietnam, South Korea, the Philippines, Malaysia, Japan and Hongkong. This fact alone indicates that in practice the NSA leaders departed widely from their avowed aim of developing friendly contacts with students of all countries regardless of their ideological convictions.

To achieve its real aims, the NSA needed well-trained people, and it always devoted a great deal of attention to this aspect of its activity. The necessary training was to a large extent accomplished through a program of seminars on problems of the international student movement. A considerable part of the \$256,000 which the NSA received between 1962 and 1965 from the CIA through the Independence Foundation was spent on organizing and conducting these seminars. The NSA staffed its international department with students who went through the seminar program, and it was from among the seminar graduates that candidates for various foundation scholarships for "study" abroad were selected.

There was not a hint at the seminars of that stay-clear-of-politics position which the NSA leadership had for so long urged American students to espouse as a fundamental principle of their behavior during their university years. On the contrary, the seminars were loaded with political content fully in line with Washington's official policy.

Let us take, for example, the Latin American themes. In the course of a single year (1965), the NSA organized seminars, conferences and forums on such themes as "The Alliance for Progress" (at the Catholic University in Washington), "Militarism in Latin America" (at the University of New Mexico), and "Problems of Latin American Democracy" (at the University of Redlands). In that same year, the NSA took an active part in the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, which was held in Philadelphia and was devoted to the theme, "Latin

America Tomorrow", and in a conference held in Texas on the theme, "The Challenges of the Americas". Jointly with the US Youth Council, the NSA conducted special seminars on Latin America at universities in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Boston. However, its basic measure along these lines was an annual forum at the University of Notre Dame on the theme, "Latin America: the Emerging Challenge", where one NSA "expert" on Latin America delivered a lecture on the student movement in Latin America and the upsurge of the Latin American Left movement, and another presented a report "Student Politics in Latin America". Just the titles of the lectures and reports indicate the growing uneasiness on the part of the NSA leaders about the situation in Latin America, where the student movements are taking an increasingly resolute stand on the side of the forces of progress, democracy and national liberation and boldly joining forces with the working class and other groups of working people in their fight against American imperialist oppression, in support of the Cuban revolution and against US military adventures in the Dominican Republic, Panama and other countries of the continent.

These are only a few ways and means the US Establishment uses to employ a number of youth organizations as a tool in carrying out its anti-democratic domestic and reactionary foreign policies.

As for the ISC, all of its activities were an example of intrigue, subterfuge, bribery and hypocrisy aimed at splitting the international student movement in the countries it had access to.

In February 1969, the premises of the NSA national headquarters at 2115 C Street in Washington were undergoing repairs. Carpenters, plasterers and painters were busy fixing up the place. In the meantime, the NSA leaders were wondering how to patch up their organization and on what basis to regain the influence it had lost among students.

After the NSA's connections with the CIA were exposed, *Time* magazine quoted Allen Dulles as saying: "We obtained what we wanted." Of the Communists, he said: "We stopped them in certain areas, and the student area was one of them." Empty boasting! In recent years in the United States as well as in other parts of the world, students extended their activity in political matters, in the struggle for de-

mocracy and social progress and against imperialism. As the main document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stated, "young people, students in particular, black and white, are in revolt in different ways against the Vietnam war, military conscription, racism, and monopoly control of universities."

How did it happen that such great numbers of American students who had only recently stayed out of politics are becoming so actively involved in the democratic movement and political struggle?

#### A CRACK APPEARS IN THE IVORY TOWER

In the early 1950s, when the connection between the CIA and the NSA were first made, McCarthyism and the Cold War had such a grip on the country that very few American students felt inclined to give serious thought to questions of their government's domestic and foreign policy. Indeed, the interests and activities of almost the entire student population in the United States at that time were strictly apolitical, a situation that was actively nurtured by the Establishment not without the help of US student leaders. Even the delegates to the NSA annual congresses, to say nothing of the great mass of the country's students, were left in the dark about many of the organization's actions. And the students themselves showed little interest in what the NSA leadership was doing, especially in the international student movement.

The NSA leaders were so sure that this would always be the case and relied so heavily on the omnipotence of the CIA that they stopped taking cognizance of the sentiments of their own rank and file and of the objective situation on US college campuses.

But the years of stagnation were destined to come to an end. The objective and subjective prerequisites for a growth of democratic sentiments among youth had long been in the process of maturing in the United States and in the early 1960s evolved into concrete forms of protest, primarily on the part of students.

It cannot be said that in the past American students engaged in no political activity at all. However their politics boiled down to conducting student government election

campaigns and supporting Democratic or Republican candidates in local or national elections. In any event, such political activity as they did engage in was never connected with protest against established norms or with any tendency to question the existing political system. What is new about the US student movement today is not so much heightened political activity as the fact that this activity is based on a dissatisfaction with "the American way of life". Now it is not only question of reforms; the entire social, economic and political structure of American society is being put to question.

The radicalization of American students gains momentum as the consequences of the general crisis of contemporary American society are more and more sharply felt by the country's youth.

One particular manifestation of the crisis is the aggressive foreign policy of American imperialism, which has resulted in a situation where the threat of being drafted continually hangs over the young men of America. As noted in the New Program of the Communist Party, USA, adopted in 1969 by its 19th Convention, "They are the first generation in US history to know conscription as the normal way of life. They are the first to live only under the nuclear cloud."

The crisis of modern American society finds its most acute and unseemly forms of expression in segregation and racial discrimination. One hundred years after Lincoln's Emancipation proclamation which freed Negroes in the South, the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not been completed to all intents and purposes. The reactionary forces still cling to racism as a means of fighting all progressive movements and splitting the working class and youth. Racism is a breeding-ground for chauvinism, while freedom for the Negro in American society has become the touchstone of genuine freedom for all.

American youth are not somehow insulated from the ongoing processes of social development in the modern epoch, the main content of which is the transition from capitalism to socialism. They cannot but show an interest in the political, social, economic and cultural developments in the world opposing the world of capitalism, that is, in the socialist countries, above all, the Soviet Union. Such interest has been especially pronounced ever since the launching of



the first artificial earth satellite, the Sputnik—the outstanding achievement of Soviet science and technology which marked the advent of the space era.

The launching of the first Soviet Sputnik provided the impetus for American youth to go beyond the rigid framework of official propaganda and to take a closer and more realistic look at the surrounding world, especially at the world of socialism. The socialist world's accomplishments in the fields of economics, science, technology, culture and education and its actions aimed at preserving and strengthening world peace cause many young Americans to take a broader look at the vitally important problems of the time and bring them to the realization that American society is not ideal.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the young Americans who began to protest immediately focussed their attention on critical problems of US domestic and foreign policy and that American youth suddenly realized the need for some kind of change in their country's existing social and political structure.

The development of the protest movement was attended by complex psychological processes in the consciousness of individual young Americans. This can most readily be seen from the evolution of the student.

The majority of American students come from a petty-bourgeois milieu, i.e., from the so-called "middle class", whose members tend to regard a college education merely as a means of getting the diploma necessary for landing a good job and attaining the corresponding status in society. This function of the university as a "diploma mill" was one of the basic causes giving rise to discontent and protest on the part of American students. Students became increasingly aware of the fact that a university diploma no longer guaranteed them the traditional position in society as they were led to expect. Unaware that the causes for this situation lay in deep-going changes in the capitalist society stemming from scientific and technological progress, they initially focussed all their attention on the shortcomings within the universities themselves. They soon came to the conclusion, however, that the government and the corporations which control higher education have no concern for the student as an individual. Further, they began to perceive the wide di-

vergence between the moral values of education and the values of the market on which they would be compelled to sell their intellectual labor power. At every turn, college graduates came up against the fact that society was interested not in their personal development but only in the technical skills they could offer. And they learned that without a Ph. D. they were essentially no different from skilled workers who had not invested time and effort on a university education. In his book, *Student*, progressive American sociologist David Horowitz described the conflict-producing situation in American universities:

"When a bright student does poorly the university never steps out of its impersonal attitude to find a way to the student's problem, to redeem him and release his talent. His failure, as well as his success, is entirely his own. Society experiences no responsibility to him as a person and it is not reasonable to expect that afterwards he will feel much responsibility towards society. . . . Society itself is so structured that individuals work not for each other but for themselves. . . . We have read books on careers for college grads. I remember one in particular: 'the most important product you'll ever have to sell is yourself', it said. A man is not a product, nor is he an IBM record card. He is a person with desires, fears, ambitions and a great need to feel worthwhile, to fill some space in a community of men, to do some good for them. His plea is always to be used, to be useful to someone."

The main thing that Horowitz describes—the desire to be socially useful—helped many students to see, and motivated them to protest against, defects in the American system of higher education. These defects included: segregation and racism in the system of education; the increase in the number of private educational institutions; the difference between schools in rich and poor neighborhoods with respect to the quality of education offered; the control of education by boards of trustees or regents composed mainly of people representing Big Business and other reactionary forces; widespread witch-hunts and loyalty tests in educational institutions; and, finally, the dependence of the entire educational system on foundations which subserve the interests of the Cold War, either in the military, propaganda or foreign policy spheres.

Having become acutely aware of the principal defects in the American educational system, a certain part of the student population inevitably took up the struggle for reforms and greater democracy in education and for genuine autonomy for the university. In the late fifties and early sixties this was reflected in campaigns against loyalty oaths; for the right to hear lecturers whose ideas did not necessarily reflect the official point of view; against dismissals of faculty members for political reasons; against anti-communist bias in considering student applications for scholarships; and so on.

The most progressive students came to realize, however, that the defects in the educational system were clearly symptoms of specific ills afflicting American society as a whole, and that they would have to direct their efforts against *those* ills if they expected to bring about any fundamental changes in the educational system. The development of the democratic student movement in the United States at the present stage has fully confirmed the Leninist proposition that, having embarked upon the road of struggle for so-called purely academic demands, students very soon realize that to win these demands they must "not restrict themselves to struggling merely for academic (student) freedom, but for *the freedom of the entire people, for political freedom*", and that real support for their struggle can come above all from the working classes and not from the class most of them belong to.

At the end of the fifties, American propaganda sought to describe the discontent then exhibited by only an inconsiderable number of students as a symptom of an affluent society. The theory was that since young people in such a society could obtain all the good things that go to make up the American way of life without struggle or sacrifice, they became restless, looking for some outlet for their youthful energy. However, new developments in American life and, above all, the effects of the scientific and technological progress soon showed that even for students, the majority of whom came from middle-class families, American affluence was an illusion. The change in the social and economic position of students, as part of the younger scientific and technological intelligentsia, aroused dissatisfaction among a much greater number of students, prompting them to seek

causes of the existing situation. The mere awareness of the shortcomings in the educational system suggests the idea of the unfair distribution of wealth in the United States. The fact that according to a long established tradition many American students worked during their vacations in many ways contributed to their social awareness. Today many students are anxious to find a vacation job to raise some money for a rainy day as they are not at all sure that a permanent job will be available after graduation. This makes them more mindful of the social contrasts inherent in America today, where there is rapid technological progress, but plants and factories need fewer and fewer workers; where electric computers installed in business enterprises annually displace thousands of office and administrative personnel; where despite the growth of production, slums, poverty and need cannot be abolished. Government statistics showing that one-fifth of the country's population lived in poverty acquired new and concrete meaning for students. They also see that the darker a person's skin, the lower he stands on the scale of poverty.

The disillusionment with the principal values of the American way of life among a certain part of students was the first necessary stage in the development of an independent political and social consciousness which would lead them to a search for new values and new insight into the meaning of life.

In the early 1960s this search brought American students into the peace movement. But this did not necessarily mean that they already understood the full importance of this struggle. At that time, the question of safeguarding peace was in the United States a very broad and general issue open to a diversity of interpretations; it was not an issue requiring a break with the country's social and political structure, involving, as it did, only criticism of militaristic attitudes and tendencies.

But when the American escalation of the war in Vietnam began, the struggle for peace acquired new content, the essence of which to a large extent amounted to a departure from traditional canons of anti-communism. An article in the *World Student News* described the shift in attitude on the part of many Americans in the words of an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, who



said, "Many of us who endorsed the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, who supported US action in Berlin, Korea and Cuba, are simply unwilling any longer to accept as valid the assumption that the threat communism poses is either monolithic or predominantly military. Nor are we willing any longer to credit the claim that all revolutionary disturbances are essentially 'conspiracies' engineered from the centres of Communist power.... We are determined that de facto support of non-Communist tyrants shall not be concealed by the rhetoric of the American credo. What seems especially clear to us is that our policy makers have been neither resourceful nor always committed to the value of liberty and social justice in the making of American foreign policy." To many young Americans the United States began to look less and less like a model country with a high standard of living and a magnanimous policy toward other countries. Instead they saw it more and more as a country that only knew how, by force of arms and with money, to interfere in the affairs of other countries in order to support corrupt and unpopular regimes. The magazine *Liberation* expressed the thinking of progressive American students when it wrote that "Vietnam is no accident—it is part of a declared worldwide American policy that views all internal social revolution as external aggression. Its roots lie deep in American society. It is a symptom of our society's sickness." Increasing numbers of students began to analyze that policy, its roots and their society's sickness and to draw the conclusion that radical changes were necessary in the existing social and political order in the United States.

The same conclusion was reached by American students who took an active part in the fight for civil rights. To many of them the plight of the Negro population symbolized the evils and hypocrisy of American society. A qualitatively new element was introduced into the civil rights movement in those years—namely the search for the roots of the racial problem at the very core of the system existing in the United States. This differentiated the new civil rights movement, consisting of young and predominantly black people, from long-standing organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—organizations which had for many years been functioning according to the "rules of the game", that is, without any talk about classes and

revolution and without any criticism of white liberals. In fact, the old organizations often took an anti-communist stance and showed a fear of being compromised by any connection with Communists and other progressive forces. This attitude found expression in the saying: "It's bad enough being black, but it's worse to be black and red at the same time!"

The actions of most of the young people who joined the civil rights movement in recent years constitute a direct challenge to the social and economic system in the United States. They are not fighting merely for formal rights, but for genuinely equal opportunities for blacks to work and live in a new society together with white working people. They tend to regard the racial problem as one of the basic internal contradictions in the United States.

A new element in democratic student movement in the United States today is the increasing interweavement and merger of two movements that had developed separately. One involved groups of students, who were predominantly white and of "middle-class" origin, and who at the initial stages of the protest movement concentrated their efforts on the struggle for peace. The other was the Freedom Movement, made up of groups of black youth, who were traditionally outside the white "middle class" and therefore had never accepted its values and ideas. For a time, neither side saw the possibilities for relationship between the two movements or the joint action. In the early sixties, for example, black students who were mostly concerned with civil rights showed little interest in the peace problem. In fact, to bring up any question that was not directly related to the racial aspects of segregation—even to speak in terms of the relationship between segregation and the economic structure of the country—was considered harmful to the movement.

The fact that these democratic trends were all going their separate ways made harm to the movement and consolidation of progressively minded American youth. Recent years, however, have seen a marked integration of the struggle for peace with the struggle against poverty and ignorance, the struggle for democracy and civil rights, and the struggle for economic and political equality.

Such an approach provides an excellent opportunity to examine all the acute contradictions of modern American

capitalism in their totality. Though most of the democratically minded young Americans are not yet in a position to see the whole pattern of these contradictions or to subject them to profound analysis, they do see some of their outer manifestations and are conscious of the need for radical changes. This awareness is reflected in such phrases, depending on the sphere of struggle, as changing the "system of corporate liberalism", "military-industrial complex", "the welfare and warfare state", "imperialist capitalism", "fascism in white gloves", and the like.

It is not surprising that US officialdom displays unconcealed anxiety and alarm concerning the conduct of American students. This problem receives much comment in the official American press, in the works of American philosophers, historians and sociologists and in the speeches of many American politicians. It frequently comes up on the floor of the US Congress, and is given a great deal of attention by the FBI. A 1966 directive issued by J. Edgar Hoover To All Law Enforcement Officials read, in part, as follows:

"The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the 'New Left', is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of common sense.

"Fortunately, a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hardworking, and serious-minded young people, however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking. . . . They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order." The directive then made it clear what was meant by the reference to "law and order", and what disquieted the FBI and the whole Establishment most of all.

"The Communist Party, USA, as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of

rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the communist cause . . . the communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political and social system."

The portion of the FBI directive quoted above is indicative not only of the malicious anti-communism characteristic of the FBI. Behind the rancorous language can be felt an analysis of the changes taking place on US campuses in student thinking and attitudes.

It would be a mistake, of course, to exaggerate the degree of the American students' politization as well as the extent of their ideological maturity. But the rise of democratic action on the part of American students is apparent. It is equally indisputable that in the course of such action their political awareness grows.



## STUDENT POWER

When democratically minded American students advanced the slogan Student Power, several years ago, reactionary elements in the country were quick to interpret it as a call for students to seize political and state power. This interpretation played into the hands of the Establishment, which raised a great hue and cry demanding suppression of the rebels before they plunged the country into chaos. Herbert Marcuse, who is sometimes portrayed as the ideologist of rebelling students, warned of undesirable consequences if student power were to become a reality. In an interview Marcuse stated: "Everywhere and at all times the overwhelming majority of students are conservative and even reactionary. So that student power, in the event of it being democratic, would be conservative or even reactionary."

All this clamor was needed by the Establishment to justify its refusal to meet student demands and to convince public opinion that the students were demanding the impossible.

Contrary to the reactionaries, however, most American students imbue the Student Power slogan with realistic and democratic content. They demand such academic, social and political rights as would guarantee them the opportunity of being full-fledged citizens carrying full responsibility for their own affairs and those of the university and society. This is what the frequent demonstrations and "rebellions" on US campuses in recent years have been all about.

## EXPLOSION AT BERKELEY

The University of California, Berkeley, received world-wide attention due to the events of the 1964/65 academic year.

In the winter of 1964/65 the students of the University of California staged protests when the administration prohibited political and public organizations engaged in off-campus activity to collect money, pass out literature and enlist new members on campus, an established practice at Berkeley. The student dissent attracted special attention as Berkeley was prominent among American universities. There were 27,500 students at Berkeley, it was maintained at the expense of the state, tuition was free and the faculty highly qualified (including several Nobel Prize winners). The university is also widely known for its tolerance in political and social issues.

The above report appeared in the magazine *America* a year after the events had taken place. The magazine also quoted an unidentified foreign visitor to Berkeley as saying that there was hardly another place in the world where the dissenter enjoyed greater privileges. At the time of the events, however, reports in the official press and the statements made by certain politicians and university officials were of a somewhat different tone. This is what they wrote and said then:

Governor of California Edmund G. Brown—"We cannot compromise with revolution, whether at the University or any other place."

Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, Edward Strong—"The legitimate authority of the university is being challenged and attacked in a revolutionary way."

*The Reporter*—"Improbable as it may have seemed to outsiders, events at the Berkeley campus ... constituted a small-scale but genuine revolution. Through continuous violation of university regulation, sit-ins, almost daily mass demonstrations, and finally a strike by students and teaching assistants, the authority of both the administration and the faculty had become virtually nonexistent by December."

*Life* magazine—"...this minority managed to inflame one of the largest collections of young brains in the US, caused a shutdown of classes, brought 500 cops to Sproul Hall to make 782 arrests, got nearly 10,000 signatures on a petition to the Regents and won an endorsement of its demands from a pretty big majority of the faculty. How did they do it?"

How *did* they do it? But first, another question: what were the students fighting for at Berkeley?

The actual student protest began when, on September 14, 1964, the Administration announced that the Bancroft-Telegraph area adjacent to the campus was University property. Traditionally, it had been a place where various student groups of a political character could carry on their activities. But with its inclusion in the campus the students lost this opportunity because, according to university regulations, groups connected with off-campus organizations were not allowed to engage in propaganda, fund-raising, etc. on university grounds.

This measure was designed to block the activities of those groups at the university who had fought against McCarthyism, the loyalty oath, and the actions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on campus, and who were now taking an active part in the struggle for civil rights and liberty, for world peace and an end to American imperialist aggression in Vietnam.

It was no accident that the US monopoly circles singled out Berkeley as the main target for an offensive against the elementary rights of students. They had long been troubled by the fact that by that time more than 10 per cent of the university's students had taken a direct part in civil rights protests both in the Deep South and in their own state.

The purpose of the offensive was to suppress further growth of democratic tendencies among the students. The powers that be expected no serious resistance. But the students did resist. They met the challenge by engaging in open struggle. It was a struggle for elementary democratic rights—freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom to take action in regard to political and social problems. The attitude of the students was aptly expressed by one of the leaders of the Berkeley protests, Bettina Aptheker, who said that these rights were in the Constitution only because no one enjoyed them and not the other way around. The Berkeley students were determined to avail themselves of these rights by struggle.

They made no excessive demands. Their first demand was a rule, contained in official university documents, to the effect that the university may not take disciplinary action against members of the university community or organizations engaged in political activity. In such cases, members of the university community fall within the jurisdiction of

the civil authorities. In other words, the students wanted any cases against them relating to their political activities to be tried in civil court, rather than being decided by an arbitrary ruling of the university authorities, which could entail just as arbitrary disciplinary action against them, including suspension or expulsion from the university.

But even in this more than modest demand, the administration perceived a threat to power and authority by which it sought to control thoughts and behavior of students, and by virtue of which it could declare any of their activities unlawful and subject to disciplinary action. The administration announced that university regulations were not subject to discussion and only it could determine what was legal and what illegal.

On October 5, 1964, in response to the administration's actions, the students organized the Free Speech Movement which led the struggle at the university.

Such was the state of affairs in regard to the "tolerance in political and social issues" at Berkeley, referred to in the quotation from *America*.

But the students' struggle in the fall and winter of 1964/65 was not only for democratic rights. It was also a struggle for social justice and intellectual freedom, and a fight against the gross defects in the US system of higher education.

Now let us see if there was any truth to the assertion that there was hardly another place in the world where the dissenter enjoyed greater privileges, alleged by the magazine *America* to have been made by a foreign visitor to Berkeley at the time.

It turns out that many Americans, including permanent residents of Berkeley, had a different opinion. For example, professors of political science at Berkeley Sheldon Wolin and John Schaar wrote in the *New York Review of Books*: "To many of the students, the whole system seems a perversion of an educational community into a factory designed for the mass processing of men into machines.... What happened at Berkeley cannot be understood as the delinquent outbursts of fanatics and ungrateful rebels." These students broke the rules and the law in an agonizing effort to compel to action an Administration which was unwilling to listen to their just claims and to treat them as participating members of a community of the intellect.



According to *America*, the disorders were sparked by the arrest of a student who deliberately violated an administration ruling.

It is not worth going into the oversimplified way in which the magazine regarded the problem of disorders. But it also distorted the facts. Jack Weinberg, a member of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the person referred to in the magazine as "a student", was arrested, together with other students, on October 1 for passing out CORE literature. This was another act by the administration and police designed to intimidate the students and force them to abandon the struggle. The day before, on September 30, the administration took disciplinary action against eight students who were members of other democratic student organizations. When the eight were summoned to the dean's office, 450 other students showed up and declared that they were also subject to disciplinary action because they had taken part in the activity for which the eight students were being punished. The administration refused to speak with them, and the students staged a sit-in. The administration resorted to a new provocation by suspending the eight students for an indefinite period of time.

Thus, the arrest of Jack Weinberg was the third provocation in two days. But the administration's attempts at intimidation were unsuccessful. The students at Berkeley decided to continue the struggle. Demonstrators surrounded the police car holding Weinberg and staged a sit-down strike around it, preventing the police from driving the arrested student away. A rally was organized on the spot and speakers demanded that charges against the eight students who had been suspended be dropped, that Jack Weinberg be released and that university rules be changed to provide for political freedom on campus.

Late that night, some two hundred counter-demonstrators appeared on the scene. They proceeded to hurl obscene epithets at the students as well as cigarette butts and rotten eggs. They were trying to provoke a fight so that the police could interfere and disperse the students from around the car. But the students would not be provoked and remained seated at their places. In spite of the fact that it was nighttime their number grew, and the hecklers were compelled to leave.

Then the police were brought in. The campus was invaded by 700 policemen carrying clubs and armed with tear gas. All the students taking part in the sit-down around the police car were threatened with arrest and warned that if they did not disperse in a matter of ten minutes, the police would resort to their clubs and tear gas. The students were forced to back down, but the sit-down had given them a chance to feel their strength and confirmed their determination to continue the struggle.

The leaders of the movement at Berkeley were progressive students whose sentiments were understood and endorsed by the major part of the student body. And they were able to hold this confidence of the students throughout the struggle.

"A woman of deeds". This was what the students protesting in Berkeley at that time called Bettina Aptheker, a young Communist and daughter of the prominent American Communist, Herbert Aptheker. Although Bettina was only 20 years old (she was born in 1944, in Fort Bragg, North Carolina), she had already taken part in various political manifestations even before the events at Berkeley. During her first year at the University of California she became actively involved in the civil rights movement and fought against racial discrimination in employment. It was during that campaign that she was arrested for the first time. Her second arrest came during the winter events of 1964/65. Miss Aptheker took part in demonstrations, spoke at meetings and was one of the student representatives in negotiations with the authorities. She won the respect and admiration of the students for her inexhaustible energy, organizational talent and determination to press their just demands. In her campaign as a candidate for one of the offices in the student government, Bettina Aptheker emphatically condemned the aggression of American imperialism in Vietnam and openly declared of her membership in the Communist Party. Nonetheless, she received more votes than any other candidate and was elected student representative at this large university.

The fact that a Communist was elected to a university student government for the first time in the postwar history of the student movement showed that students were beginning to reject anti-communism. They wanted real student

self-government bodies that would fight for the satisfaction of their vital demands.

The magazine *America* maintained that none of the student organizations was authorized to represent the interests of the heterogeneous student body.

In fact, the student organizations financed by the monopolies did prove to be ineffective in the face of the events that took place at Berkeley.

The only thing the National Student Association was concerned about was for the movement originating in Berkeley not to assume national proportions, and in this connection it timidly spoke out for concessions on the part of the administration. It sought to gloss over the real causes and aims of the struggle and reduce everything to the question of the procedure followed in suspending and taking disciplinary action against students. The NSA branch in Berkeley—the Student Association at the University Campus—adopted a similar position and even tried to intimidate the students with threats of mass expulsions, thereby contributing to the administration's efforts to break the resistance of the students.

The reactionary forces adopted their favorite method of anti-communism. The president of the university, Clark Kerr, declared that 49 per cent of the demonstrators around the car were Communists or Communist sympathizers. But if he thought that this would drive the great mass of students away from the protest movement, he was mistaken. It was too obvious that the demonstrators' demands were just and that they subserved the interests of the majority of students. In the end, the statements of the administration only enhanced the prestige enjoyed by the students who were heading the protest.

To countervail the Student Association at the University Campus which could only impede the movement, students set up their own organizations, most notably the Associated Students and the Graduate Coordinating Council. The emergence of the new organizations clearly showed the desire of undergraduate and postgraduate students to take a real part in university affairs. They willingly cooperated with the student political organizations, above all with those of a democratic character, because the events that had happened by that time convinced many students that the

only way to put an end to the arbitrary rule of the administration was forming a strong coalition of all the groups on campus.

Such a union took place in the form of the Free Speech Movement mentioned above. A kind of united student front emerged at the university.

One can hardly agree, then, with the statement in the magazine *America*, that none of the student organizations represented the interests of the heterogeneous student body. The fact of the matter is that the state authorities and the university administration simply refused to recognize the legitimate representatives of the mass university-wide student movement.

The just nature of the student demands was so patently clear that many of the university's faculty members supported them, and some, mostly from among the younger teachers, took part in the student demonstrations and sit-ins.

The struggle acquired fresh impetus in early December, when the Steering Committee of the Free Speech Movement was accused of organizing the unlawful demonstrations of October 1 and 2, in spite of the fact that at that time the Movement itself had not yet been organized. On December 2, in response to the accusations, a sit-in, which lasted for 36 hours and in which 800 students participated, was staged in the university's Sproul Hall. The Governor of the State of California, Edmund Brown, ordered 600 armed policemen onto the university campus to arrest the striking students.

The following is Bettina Aptheker's description of the ensuing police brutality.

"4:00 am: Fourth floor of Sproul Hall. Arrests begun. Faculty members and thousands of students began to gather outside Sproul Hall. Through the wee hours of the morning, and on into Thursday afternoon the arrests continued. It was the largest peace-time arrest in the history of the United States....

"A club smashed the window on the second floor. The glass shattered. Students screamed. The police seized the microphone as Jack Weinberg tried to speak to the thousands outside, over our PA system, to tell them what was going on inside....

"Members of the Faculty Student Conduct Committee



tried to get into Sproul Hall to witness the arrests. They were denied admittance by the police. Campus police then blocked the windows of the building with newspapers so that reporters and faculty outside could not see in.

"Some members of the faculty tried to see President Kerr and other administrators. They could not meet with them.

"The police hurled epithets.... Our arms were twisted. We were dragged up and down stairs. Limp bodies hurled through the air."

The police arrested 800 students. Most of them were taken to the Santa Rita Prison Farm, 35 miles from Berkeley which during the war had been used as a concentration camp for Japanese Americans.

The entire university was shocked by this act of police brutality. Shortly after the arrests, a group of faculty members appeared at the gates of the Santa Rita Prison Farm demanding that the students be immediately released. On campus, special faculty meeting was held at which a resolution was passed denouncing the actions of the Governor and expressing support of the Free Speech Movement. In the afternoon of the same day, the leaders of the movement held a rally which was attended by 15,000 persons. In many of the classrooms, faculty members left notions on the blackboards, saying, "I will not teach while 600 police are on my campus". Picket lines, in which there were students and some faculty members, appeared before all the administrative and campus buildings.

This was the beginning of a strike which was to last for several days and involve 80 per cent of the student body and a considerable part of the faculty. On the first day, the reactionary newspapers played down the strike or tried to make it out as a failure; by the third day, however, "even the Hearst Press had to admit that to some extent, at least, the strike was effective".

The Free Speech Movement received support from various quarters during those days. The faculty raised the \$ 8,500 for the students' bail. Seventy-five lawyers expressed their willingness to defend the arrested students in court, free of charge. Some labor unions expressed their solidarity with the students. The Union of Agricultural Workers in Los Angeles, the Central Labor Councils of Alameda, San Francisco and Contra Costa Counties, and the longshoremen's

union supported the strike outright, denounced the sending of police onto the campus, and demanded that the regents and the administration grant students full political freedom. Members of the teamsters' union refused to cross student picket lines on the campus.

Greetings and telegrams expressing solidarity with the striking students poured in and a number of organizations issued special statements in this connection. A statement by George Hardy, Secretary of the State Council of Building Service Employees, for example, noted that "an institution claiming to be one of the great Universities of the world has committed a shameful act". Hardy called for the release of the arrested students, support of their aims and demands, and democratization of the university's board of regents so that it would include real representatives of the people.

The students taking part in a meeting at which this statement was read greeted it enthusiastically. Most of them came face to face with working-class solidarity for the first time, and circumstances now caused them to stop and think about where, among what strata of the population, they might seek aid and support.

In the meantime, the Academic Senate convened and was attended by a record number of over 900 faculty members. Six thousand students waited outside to hear the decision of the Senate. By a majority of votes, the Senate passed a resolution in favor of satisfying some of the students' demands, specifically, it decided that there should be no rules restricting the freedom of speech with respect to content; that rules regulating the time, place and character of political activity on campus should be limited to such as are absolutely necessary for the normal functioning of the university; and that in the sphere of political activity, questions of student discipline should be exclusively the province of the faculty.

But the board of regents refused to transfer disciplinary power from the administration to the faculty. Moreover, at a meeting of the board the regents set up a secret committee to investigate communist influence in the Free Speech Movement. The administration, especially Chancellor Strong, employed every maneuver to nullify the decisions of the Academic Senate.

The struggle continued. The Free Speech Movement

mobilized public opinion in support of the 800 students who had been arrested and were now awaiting trial.

The students were ready to swing into action again at any moment. Finally, the administration was forced to yield. Chancellor Strong, through whom the monopolies and the powers that be in the state pursued their reactionary policy at the university, resigned.

The newly appointed chancellor met with the leaders of the Free Speech Movement and assured them that, in the main, the demands for which the students had fought for four months would be met.

Of course, the victory was not complete. The concessions made by the administration in no way altered the system of education. The students merely achieved a certain liberalization of the rules regulating political activity on campus. The right to determine the time and place of political rallies was retained by the administration.

But the success and importance of the student demonstrations at Berkeley should not be measured only by the concessions won from the authorities. The students learned the power of united action; they realized that only by acting in unison could they force the administration and authorities to take notice of their just demands; and they demonstrated that, besides the resolutions and petitions which are, as a rule, ignored by the administration, there are other active and effective means of struggle.

The Berkeley events had a tremendous impact on students at other American universities. Even the NSA magazine, *The American Student*, had to admit this fact. "Seldom have events so shaken the American academic community as did the happenings in the Free Speech Movement controversy at the University of California, Berkeley.... The extent of the impact of 'Berkeley'... is immeasurable. In addition to stirring the Berkeley campus itself, the student protests have set off a wave of student activism across the country."

The NSA leaders apparently realized that unless they did some maneuvering, the wave of student activism could wreck or seriously undermine their positions in the student movement.

The Berkeley events thus forced the NSA leadership—and administrators of many other universities—to play up

to the students. But there were others in the field of education who could not conceal their hostility and showed their fear of the growing student interest in social and political problems by calling all active students "Reds", "campus guerillas", "rebels", "irresponsible elements", etc.

At Yale University a struggle developed against the administration's teacher employment policy. Students protested the dismissal of certain faculty members who were deemed undesirable by the authorities. Over 2,000 students took part in an open forum and in picketing that lasted for 67 hours.

The same thing occurred at Brooklyn College where Professor of Philosophy Robert Sitton was dismissed after refusing to sign a loyalty oath. In protest, 200 students walked out of a lecture being given by College President Harry D. Gideonse, who spoke of the Berkeley events from a reactionary standpoint. The students staged a demonstration against the dismissal of the professor and in support of academic freedoms and the right to admit "'controversial' organizations and speakers on campus".

At the State University of New York at Buffalo students decried the dismissal of poet Gregory Corso from a teaching position for refusing to sign a loyalty oath. One reporter wrote: "In the wake of a picket line ... students argued about ... the Corso case as heatedly as though he were a key athlete who had been flunked and was ineligible for the crucial game."

In Rutherford, N.J., 1,500 students from Fairleigh Dickinson University marched and picketed as "an expression of general student discontent". The protest came after the university failed to act promptly on a series of resolutions passed by the student government demanding greater political freedom for students and due consideration of student opinion in cases of contemplated faculty dismissals.

The rise of political militancy was also observed at universities, such as Temple University, where students were traditionally regarded as indifferent and incapable of action. At New York University 4,500 students participated in a mass meeting demanding free tuition. A movement for the appointment of atheists to the college board developed at Wake Forest College in North Carolina and at Rutgers University, N.J., there was a movement for student participation in academic planning.



All these examples are indicative of growing interest on the part of American students in important political issues, of their awakening from the many years of political apathy, of their liberation from the shackles of McCarthyism and the Cold War, and of their awareness that they must fight for their rights and democracy. The leader of the Free Speech Movement, Mario Savio, wrote in the foreword to the book, *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt*: "The Berkeley students now demand what hopefully the rest of an oppressed white middle class will some day demand: freedom for all Americans, not just for Negroes!"

The events at Berkeley and their impact on university life in the United States evoked the rage of the American reactionaries. At the same time they provided fresh evidence of the fact that the "silent generation" was acquiring the ability to speak out.

#### UNIVERSITIES UNDER SIEGE

A well-known specialist on student disorders, Harvard University Professor Seymour Lipset co-authored an article shortly after the Berkeley events which said that "one could expect similar troubles to erupt on other campuses". Five years later, in the spring of 1969 in *US News and World Report* the same Lipset recalling these words concluded: "And I'm afraid our prediction was right."

Students were rebelling not only on the West Coast, although Berkeley remained in the vanguard of the struggle (suffice it to say that there was not a single calm semester there since 1964). Student demonstrations had engulfed practically all the university centers of the country. They became usual even in the oldest institutions of higher education—the exclusive Ivy League colleges which were designed for the offspring of the ruling élite and traditionally regarded as bulwarks of American capitalism.

The political militancy of the students and the scope of their demands had grown considerably since the Berkeley events. Student demands of an academic character became more closely intertwined with general democratic and political demands.

This was exemplified by the events which took place in April 1968 at Columbia University, where in the course of

several weeks students occupied and held several university buildings and battles raged between students and police.

Columbia University is one of the oldest universities in the United States; it has an important role in the training of staunch advocates of American capitalism.

About 50 per cent of the university's budget comes from the Federal government. It also represents the interests of the Rockefeller and Morgan empires and many of the largest corporations working for the war. As Bettina Aptheker notes in her pamphlet *Columbia, Inc.*, "The Columbia faculty and its various institutes have to an alarming degree become 'think tanks' for the United States government and the giant corporations which that government serves." Extensive military research is carried on at the university by the Institute for Defense Analysis, set up in 1956 by the Defense Department. Besides applied technical military research,\* it works out plans for implementing the aggressive designs of American imperialism in other countries and also the strategy and tactics of imperialism on the domestic front. The university also has a center for Russian studies, set up with money from the Rockefeller Foundation, and Research Institute on Communist Affairs headed by the well-known anti-Communist Zbigniew Brzezinski. In July 1967, Columbia created the Southern Asian Institute as part of its School of International Affairs. Commenting on the need for the Institute, Dean Andrew Cordier of the School said: "The increasing significance of South and Southeast Asia for the United States . . . was a major consideration in taking the initiative to establish the new institute."

Many of the university's professors directly participate in the planning of US foreign policy as members of the State Department's Policy Planning Council as well as the National Security Council. Some of them are linked with the CIA. Thus, Professor Adolf Berle took part in the planning of the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. Marshall Shulman, appointed director of Columbia's International Affairs Institute in 1967, is known as a man who at one time advised the CIA on the "Russian question".

\* The military contracts of Columbia University amounted to \$16 million in 1966. The university is one of the leading institutions receiving military contracts.

Columbia University is located in New York, a city in which millions of Negroes and Puerto Ricans live. Moreover, the university buildings border upon Harlem. And yet Columbia University is a segregationist institution. Black students make up less than two per cent of the student body, while the average for the whole population is one black for every ten white people and at colleges, one black student for every thirty white students. As in all American colleges and universities, the black students at Columbia University feel isolated from the white students. They are barred from social life and many of the university activities. All the more significant, then, is the fact that the pretext for the student strike at this segregationist university in April 1968 was provided by the racial problem, specifically, the eviction of Negro families from their community to make room for university expansion\* and the construction of a new gymnasium, which, incidentally, was also to be used by Harlem residents but with a separate entrance for them, so that the white students would not mix with youth who have dark skin.

The protest of Harlem youth which had been building up for many years culminated in powerful demonstrations. Columbia University students supported their just demands by staging a strike and occupying university buildings, as a result of which 700 people were arrested. The student protest soon extended beyond the gymnasium issue. They were now demanding: higher wages for black and Puerto Rican workers and their being granted the right to organize into labor unions; the hiring of black teachers at the university; the introduction of courses on race relations; the release of all arrested students and withdrawal of charges against them; and discontinuation of the university's collaboration with the military-industrial complex, particularly with the Institute for Defense Analysis.

The actions of the Columbia University students were not an isolated phenomenon. During the same period of time,

---

\* Between 1961 and 1965, as a result of university construction, 1,900 single persons and 6,700 families—a total of 16,000 people, exclusively Negroes and Puerto Ricans—lost their houses. To add insult to injury, in response to protests by Harlem residents, administration spokesmen declared that the resettlement would remove undesirable elements constituting a threat to the peace in the area.

black students at the Northwestern University in Illinois seized the university administrative offices and held them for 36 hours. Their demands were for bigger scholarships, more black teachers on the faculty, and the introduction of courses on Afro-American literature and art.

On May 6, 1968, two hundred Stanford University students occupied a university building in protest against CIA recruitment activities on campus. The three-day sit-in ended when the student demands were met.

On the same day, barricades appeared on the campus of Cheyney State College of Pennsylvania, and its main building was occupied by students. They demanded the right to participate in running the college and called for a halt to American aggression in Vietnam.

Many other institutions of higher learning were embroiled in student turmoil.

There was no lull in campus unrest throughout 1968. Nor did it come in 1969, when I was witness to the student strike at the University of Chicago which was provoked by the dismissal of sociology teacher Marlene Dixon. It was a dull day in February. The large university yard, covered with dirty gray snow that was beginning to melt, was empty. At first glance there seemed to be no sign of the turbulent student events taking place here. But there was one building with the words "REHIRE MARLENE" written on the outside in large blue letters on a white background. The door to the building was covered with leaflets, posters and small notices. This was the very administration building that the students had occupied. It proved to be a difficult matter to get inside it; the doors were locked and behind them groups of students stood guard. It turned out that most of the students who had been occupying the building were at that moment at a meeting which was taking place nearby, so the guard at the door had been reinforced. A sign warned that administrative personnel and teachers were not allowed inside the building except for delegations coming to negotiate with the students. When, upon our request, the door was slightly opened, I showed the students my Soviet press card, which fortunately was made out in English. After a brief consultation, the students let us in.

Evidence of the week that the students had spent in the building was everywhere. The floor was strewn with strips



of paper, newspapers, cigarette butts, milk cartons and empty soft drink bottles. Loud music came from a record player, drowning the voices of students. Students and co-eds were seated on chairs, on the steps of the stairway leading up to the second storey, and right on the floor. It was evident that many of them had not had a chance to wash or change clothes for a number of days. Following the fashion introduced by the beatniks and hippies, most of them wore long hair and beards. We asked one of the students to talk with us for a few minutes and went into another room so that the music would not interfere with our conversation. Here, there was only the sound of a duplicating machine which was reproducing information on the course of the strike and the obstinate refusal of the administration to meet student demands, calls for solidarity on the part of students of other universities, a statement by Marlene Dixon, and facts on the suppression of the political and academic rights of students at the university.

Dick—as the student we spoke to was called—said that it would be difficult for him to give a detailed interview as he and some of his friends had not left the building for a whole week and were extremely tired. Most of the 400 students that had originally seized the building were rotated, but always according to a schedule so that the number of students in the building would never be less than a hundred and fifty. Dick turned out to be a student of progressive views, an active participant in the movement against the draft, and a member of one of the leading organizations of the New Left, Students for a Democratic Society, which was the initiator of the strike. Dick was a student of the department of political sciences, but he said, that since the social significance of higher education in the United States is rapidly declining, he planned to drop out of the university and devote himself fully to political activity.

In Dick's view the dismissal of Marlene Dixon merely provided pretext for the strike. Its real causes lay in the crisis of the American system of higher education, in its anti-democratic and discriminatory nature, in the suppression of academic and political rights and liberties, and in the persecution of students and faculty who hold progressive political views. As the strike was connected with the dismissal of a woman, the general problem of women's

rights had been raised and public opinion was focussed on their discrimination and inequality not only at universities but also in many other fields. Dick further said that inequality between women and men was only one aspect of the anti-democratic system existing in the country. As the democratic movement develops, the students will discover a growing number of such problems. "The feminine condition as the main issue around which the strike developed, is concrete evidence that the sceptics who maintain that with the end of the war in Vietnam the New Left will wither away are wrong. And we still have to fight for an end to the war anyway. The Vietnam war is still the main issue in our activity."

Like many of his friends, Dick was determined to continue the struggle until the administration agreed to rehire Marlene Dixon. But in the long run, he said, democratically inclined students were out to win radical changes in the system of higher education.

"We are fighting for the right to be taught by teachers of our choice, even if they are unacceptable to the administration. We are fighting to extend the rights of students to participate in university management and curriculum planning, to put an end to racial discrimination, and to achieve equal rights and opportunities for all students and faculty regardless of the color of their skin, political views or sex. The latter is borne out by the case of Marlene Dixon."

I did not have the opportunity to converse in such detail with other students participating in the strike. But from the speeches at the meeting in the next building it was clear that Dick's standpoint was shared by many, including members of the faculty. But not by everyone.

I met with Jeremy Azrael in his office in the Department of Political Sciences. He is a young professor, a Sovietologist, who has frequently visited the Soviet Union and speaks fluent Russian. It was interesting to learn the opinion of a university professor concerning the student strike. Azrael disagreed with the view that the strike was serious and that the student demands were just. He spoke of the striking students condescendingly—what would you expect from kids whose revolutionism consists exclusively of untidy dress, long hair and loud talk.

Azrael saw nothing unusual in the dismissal of Marlene Dixon, because of the specific nature of the University of Chicago. About 80 per cent of the students are postgraduates, he said, which accounts for the special requirements that faculty members must meet. As for Marlene Dixon, her "intellectual qualities" did not meet those requirements. It may be, continued Azrael, that Marlene was a fine lecturer, but a University of Chicago professor must first of all be a researcher and produce published works. Miss Dixon did not do this and therefore naturally became a victim of the well-known formula of the academic world—publish or perish! The political views of Marlene Dixon had nothing to do with it, according to Azrael. But the history of the University of Chicago in the last few years disproves such assertions. From the pamphlet entitled *Political Suppression at the University of Chicago*, which was distributed by the strikers, I learned in particular that in the spring of 1966, a teacher of history, Jesse Lemisch, lost his job for having taken part in an anti-war sit-in. From the charges made against him, it was not hard to see what was expected of University of Chicago teachers—an objective scholar must have no political convictions of his own. The well-known participant in the anti-war and civil rights movements, history professor Staughton Lynd, suffered the same fate in the fall of 1967, when he was barred an appointment at the university because of his political ideas. A young professor of logic, John Dolan, who destroyed his draft card in April 1967, was expressly told that he would not be accepted by the university because the administration considered him a "trouble-maker".

It was apparently Dick, the political science student, and not Azrael, the political science professor, who was right in his appraisal of the February 1969 events at the University of Chicago.

#### THE "HOT" SEASONS OF THE YEAR

The events at the University of Chicago in 1969 clearly showed that the decline in political activism on the part of American youth after Richard Nixon became president was only temporary. The letup, prompted primarily by the open-

ing of the four-party peace talks on Vietnam in Paris, was bound to be short-lived since the urgent problems of youth had not disappeared with the coming of the new administration.

The youth protest movement in America acquired fresh impetus. The "hot" fall and winter in American universities were followed by an even "hotter" spring. In the short space of time between October 1968 and May 1969 about 200 campuses were gripped by student unrest and rebellion, and 2,300 students arrested.

Sparks of student discontent set more and more campuses ablaze, including those that were traditionally regarded as strongholds of American capitalism. In April 1969, the protest movement spread to Harvard University, a university which, according to *US News and World Report*, "was considered almost immune to campus rebellions that have swept the nation since 1964". The students demanded that ROTC courses be excluded from the requisite curriculum. The demand was won but at the cost of the blood of 37 students who were wounded in clashes with the police. The *US News and World Report* admitted that "because of the prestige the university has traditionally held in the academic community" the events at Harvard would have a telling effect upon other institutions. This was certainly true, but the magazine failed to note another point, namely, that there were more than enough explosive issues on any university campus and in the educational system as a whole to provoke student protest.

These issues included the lack of elementary rights for students; control over the educational process and all aspects of academic life by the military-industrial complex; compulsory ROTC courses; the intimate relationship between universities and corporations engaged in war production and federal agencies associated with the US aggressive expansionist foreign policy; racial segregation; etc.

These were the factors underlying the massive student demonstrations which took place in the spring of 1969 at the University of California, Washington State University, the Massachusetts and California institutes of technology and elsewhere.

At Cornell, Harvard, Atlanta University Center, and



many other universities, student turbulence revolved around racial problems.

The ineffectual reforms in the sphere of desegregation in education carried out in accordance with the Civil Rights Act, which was supposed to guarantee the Negro population a worthy place in the Great Society, did not alter the essential class and racist nature of American higher education. Black students still found the doors to universities either shut tight or only slightly ajar.

The protest against de facto segregation in American higher education gathered momentum in American universities. In a number of instances it assumed acute forms.

Thus, in April 1969, the black students of Cornell University went on strike. Technically segregationist barriers to student enrolment were abolished at this university in 1964, but by 1969, it had only 250 black students. For several years, these students had actively sought to achieve equal status in the university proposing such measures as the introduction of courses in Afro-American history and culture. But all in vain. The university administration had turned a deaf ear to their demands. Finding all other avenues blocked, the students finally decided to stage a strike by occupying the building of the university's student union. When a group of Rightist students tried to evict the black youth, the latter armed themselves, a fact used by bourgeois propaganda for whipping up chauvinism in the country.

The anti-military program of progressive American students was the object of especially fierce attacks. The well-known American columnist, James Reston, painted a bleak picture of what would happen if student demands were met: abolition of the ROTC at universities would only aggravate the atmosphere of militarism in the country, because then the entire officer corps would be trained in isolation from society, away from the academic atmosphere of the university; abolition of the draft would only help to bring about the creation of a highly paid volunteer army, and possibly strong military units of "black mercenaries" as well. In subsequent articles, Reston was even more explicit about what worried the American bourgeoisie most of all in connection with the growth of student demonstrations. This, in his

words, was "the seizure and destruction of private property".

As soon as the sacrosanct foundations of the capitalist order are threatened, the bourgeoisie, instead of relying on its usual demagoguery, throws its apparatus of violence and repression into action. Life itself compels students increasingly to go over to revolutionary struggle against the forces of the old world. While the imperialist bourgeoisie might tolerate dissent it will never put up with revolutionary tendencies.

More and more often, the police, the National Guard and regular army troops, using not only clubs and tear gas, but guns, are brought in to suppress student demonstrations. The number of students wounded, arrested and expelled from universities mounted. In the spring of 1969 a bill was introduced in the US Congress which would make the disruption of the academic process a "crime". There was a step-up in the activity of the House Representatives Committee on Internal Security, which now fulfills the function of the former House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All these repressive measures were aimed primarily against the young militants who fought against the war and for civil rights. In other words, they were aimed against the movements presently uniting the most progressive part of the younger generation in the United States.

But even repression could not break the militant spirit of American youth. After summer vacation, despite the cool weather, a "hot" fall began in American universities. Students took a very active part in all the fall anti-war activities. On October 15, 1969, the first Vietnam Moratorium Day, students in 400 universities and colleges boycotted classes in a protest against the government's Vietnam policy. In those days, many of them went to factories, stores and office buildings to agitate for an end to the war and the withdrawal of all American troops from the territory of Vietnam.

In a number of instances the students were joined by faculty members. Whereas, a year before, in the April 1968 strike, the students of Columbia University had had to wage their struggle alone, now the university senate officially approved the October 15 boycott of classes and passed a resolution calling for an immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Students also took an active part in the March Against Death on November 14 in Washington, and in all the subsequent events of the second Vietnam Moratorium.

The struggle did not abate in winter either, which the American press also called "hot". The "hot" winter was followed by an even "hotter" spring. From mid-January to early April 1970 student unrest and clashes with the police were registered in 92 universities.

The students of Saint Louis University (Missouri) were on strike for eleven days in an effort to drive Pentagon officers from campus. Fourteen students were wounded in a clash with police. Massive arrests were made among students of Maryland University who had held campus buildings during two weeks. The students of Southern Illinois University were on strike for over a month in a protest against that university's role in the planning of American imperialist expansion in Southeast Asia. In the one month of April alone, there was unrest at about 300 US colleges and universities. But official America remained indifferent to the just student demands. Instead of undertaking efforts to resolve the urgent issues, the authorities resorted to even stronger repressive measures.

Opposing bourgeois and opportunist theories which divorce the student movement in the modern world from the objective process of social development is the Leninist teaching on the direct relationship between student demonstrations and the crisis of the social system. Lenin regarded student unrest as an important sign of upsurge in the revolutionary movement. "The beginning of a mass student struggle ... is a political symptom, a symptom of the whole present situation..." The causes of the swing in the student movement can be correctly determined only from these Leninist positions.

#### NATIONAL STUDENT STRIKE

America saw and learned a great deal in the sixties. She witnessed the expansion of the movement for the freedom and equality of the black population, a movement in which young men and women became the militant vanguard; a

powerful anti-war movement in which students played a prominent role; massive demonstrations for peace, democracy and social and economic rights; rebellions in the ghettos, student strikes, the seizure of campus buildings, and bloody clashes with police. . . .

The events were varied as were the reasons and motives that brought young Americans into the movement. But the mass character of the movement and the political consciousness of its participants grew from one event to the next. All this was clearly reflected in the turbulent and bloody American May of 1970.

In spite of all the efforts of the government to stamp out the fire of democratic and anti-war dissent, the militant actions of Left radical youth and students did not cease for a single day. Moreover, the experience gained in the course of the struggle taught young Americans to plan their undertakings with greater thoroughness, give deep thought to the forms and methods of their organization, strive for unity of action on the part of the various segments of the democratic youth movement, and focus attention on individual, cardinal issues.

In early spring 1970 students at Yale University set up a strike steering committee, which included representatives of Left radical organizations and members of militant organizations of Negro youth. The committee's aim was to organize May Day demonstrations, strikes and meetings in defense of democracy, in protest against the aggression of American imperialism in Vietnam and demanding a halt to the persecution of members of the Black Panther Party and the release of its national chairman, Bobby Seale, from jail. The main events, in which about 12,000 people coming from various states participated, took place on May 1 at Yale University in New Haven. Although the local storekeepers had closed their stores in advance, their fears proved unfounded; the demonstration assumed a peaceful nature. Nor were the participants provoked by the arrival of 2,500 National Guardsmen and 4,000 marines in New Haven prior to the demonstration. The leaders of the committee once again called for calm and order. In particular, Kenneth Mills, a black professor at the University of Cambridge, told the participants: "It is not a time to be violent. . . . There should be no violence over the weekend, but that does not mean you



are not militant." A leader of the anti-war movement, David Dellinger, called for the participants not to be provoked "into violent action". The members of the Black Panther Party even sent out special patrols to keep the passions down.

And yet violence was provoked; not on May 1, though, but two days later, and not merely in New Haven but all over the country. It was not the Left radical students or Black Panthers who did it. A crisis had been emerging in the country; the policies of the Establishment created such disunity that even New York Mayor John Lindsay admitted: "The country is virtually on the edge of a spiritual—and perhaps even a physical—breakdown . . . for the first time in a century, we are not sure there is a future for America." This statement was made by Lindsay in connection with the invasion of Cambodia by American troops. The president had banked on the anti-communism of Americans, and promised to display photographs of the command headquarters of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam on the territory of Cambodia in several days. The photographs never appeared on the pages of American newspapers and magazines, and on the very next day the whole country, above all the universities, was engulfed by anti-war demonstrations.

Kent State University (Ohio) became the scene of tragic events. Kent State was always a typical American university. Before the sixties, it had attracted public attention only once, in 1958, when 29 students were expelled for taking part in a panty raid. At the end of the sixties, under the impact of the growth of the Left radical student movement in the country, Kent was also rapidly politicized. The Students for a Democratic Society and the black students' union demonstrated at the university in November 1968 against the recruiting activities of the police among graduates. Many of the demonstrators were arrested. Thereupon, 300 black students declared that they would leave the university if the charges against the arrested students were not dropped. In April, clashes took place between members of Students for a Democratic Society prohibited. At the beginning of the next academic year, 81 protesting against ROTC courses and police, as a result of which 37 students were expelled from the university, five brought to trial, and the organization's

on-campus activity per cent of the students\* demanded that the police repeal the ban on SDS activity at the university.

On May 1, 1970, Kent students staged a massive protest demonstration against the military invasion of Cambodia. The next day, units of the National Guard arrived on campus to disperse the demonstrators. On May 3, the Governor of Ohio, James A. Rhodes, called the students part of "the strongest, well-trained, militant revolutionary group that has ever assembled in America". He declared a curfew and called out a mechanized regiment and infantry battalion to fight the "revolution" and "eradicate the problem". All meetings or rallies on campus were prohibited, but the students refused to obey the Governor's orders. On May 4, the "victory bell" rang out ominously at the university stadium, rallying students to the demonstration, the same bell that had usually been used only to announce the victories of the university's sports' teams. The National Guardsmen, under orders of the Governor, proceeded "to eradicate the problem". Firing tear gas bombs, they advanced in battle formation against the demonstrators not only with fixed bayonets, but also with 45-mm machine guns. Some of the students started to throw rocks. Then without prior warning, a group of National Guardsmen fired into the demonstrators. Twelve students were wounded and four, including two girls, were killed: Allison Krause, Sandra Scheuer, Jeffrey Miller and William Schroeder.

The authorities tried vainly to justify the volley fired by the National Guard, alleging that it was in response to a sniper's shot coming from the demonstrators and that the lives of the soldiers were in danger. But the story convinced no one; it was an obvious fabrication. Not a single National Guardsman had so much as a scratch from the rocks thrown by students because they had been too far away.

America did not remain indifferent to the shots that sounded in Kent.

Reactionaries and ultras rejoiced, exclaiming "It's about time we showed that scum what's what!" or "They were asking for it and got what they deserved!"

To smooth over the breach, high government officials rushed to meet with students, exuding hypocrisy and mouth-

\* Total enrolment at the university is about 20,000.

1967

**ERRATUM**    *Sentence should read:*

p. 108. 5th  
line from  
bottom

In April, clashes took place between members of Students for a Democratic Society protesting against ROTC courses and police, as a result of which 37 students were expelled from the university, five brought to trial, and the organisation's on-campus activity prohibited. At the beginning of the next academic year, 81 per cent of the students\* demanded that the police repeal the ban on SDS activity at the university.



ing trite expressions of sympathy and regret. Secretary of Labor George Shulz invited students to his home to eat fried chicken. Commenting on a conversation with the then presidential advisor Henry Kissinger, a student from Stanford University said that "it was a disappointing dialogue with the deaf".

The American liberal bourgeoisie also joined in on the "pacification" of students. On the one hand, the liberals strongly recommended that the president pay greater attention to youth so that channels of communication with them would not be completely destroyed. Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel even cited the history of the American revolution which, he maintained, had turned into war because the protest of its young leaders had not been heeded, and advised that the protest of today's youth be heeded. On the other hand, some bourgeois liberals tried to frighten the public by suggesting that "a university politicized by the extreme left can easily be controlled at another time by the extreme right". In effect, then, they were calling upon students not to support the militant actions of the Left radical youth organizations and student groups.

There is no question that power, the means of repression, property and propaganda are all in the hands of the government, the reactionary forces, the bourgeois parties and the liberals. They continue to influence the views of the average American. But a growing number of young persons and those who sympathize with them are beginning to think and shape their social behavior independently.

The shots at Kent also brought many moderate Americans, who had never before taken part in social protest, into the columns of demonstrators. Their thoughts and emotions were aptly expressed by Klaus Liepmann, a teacher at MIT: "However, there are times when 'business as usual' becomes a crime. All this reminds me sadly of the Hitler years in Germany . . . when citizens were turned against each other, one side calling the other 'Communists, traitors, bums', when atrocities were committed in the name of law and order. . . . In Germany many great masses of people, notably the intellectuals, remained passive—they called it nonpolitical. . . . I feel it is our duty as intellectuals and artists to speak up now and to act now."

Young America did act. Almost 2,500 campuses (including

900 junior colleges) became the scenes of some kind of protest action. In one university after another, students, often with faculty support, were demonstrating, boycotting classes, holding meetings, passing resolutions denouncing the US government war policy, etc. By May 7, 200 universities and colleges were in the grips of student strikes with all classes in them suspended. Almost all the other universities and colleges throughout the country were swept by a continuous wave of demonstrations and other protest action in which the majority of the students participated.

The National Guard was brought onto university and college campuses in Illinois, Maryland, New Mexico, Wisconsin, Kentucky and Ohio.

At Campus Oval (Ohio) 400 policemen and 1,700 National Guardsmen were moved against 4,000 demonstrators. 500 students were arrested and 95 wounded.

At a mass meeting at Stanford University, students and faculty adopted a resolution qualifying the invasion of Cambodia as "misplaced, immoral and barbarous".

A ninety-minute sit-in took place at the University of Cincinnati, and 145 participants were arrested.

Striking students at Princeton University proclaimed that the "strike will continue until Princeton takes an institutional stand against the war and severs all ties with the Department of Defense".

In Philadelphia, students seized a National Guard tank and used it as a tribune for their anti-war meeting.

At Whittier College, 60 per cent of the students took part in anti-war demonstrations.

University of Wisconsin students defied National Guard bayonets with the battle cry of "We're gonna open up a second front in Madison, Wisconsin". Real battles raged in front of an Army Mathematics Research Center building which was occupied by police and the National Guard. The students redeployed and attacked several times. Not only tear gas and bayonets, but even helicopters were used to disperse the demonstrators. The students cried out to the police: "Don't you guys see? We bomb and we bomb and we bomb, and we kill and we kill and we kill. Stop it." But in response, they received, as a rule, violent beatings. In the two days of fighting with the police and the National Guard, 138 students were wounded and 182 arrested. After the

arrests and beatings, the faculty decided to suspend classes for a week as a sign of solidarity with the students, and the university president Fred Harvey Harrington resigned.

In California, the student movement assumed such proportions and intensity that, fearing it would spread, Governor Ronald Reagan, known for his ultra-Rightist views, personally ordered all 28 campuses to be closed down. He thereby broke the promise he had given six months earlier (in connection with a student strike) to the effect that he would not tolerate the closing down of educational institutions even if it meant using bayonets.

Immediately after the Kent tragedy, Left radical student organizations, in addition to organizing protests on individual campus, began to stage national demonstrations. Student leaders from formerly élite Ivy League universities assembled in New York and called for a national student strike. Their call was supported by the New Mobilization Committee and the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Together with other groups, these two organizations also sponsored a national anti-war demonstration, held in Washington in memory of the students who had died at Kent. In a proclamation issued in this connection the Student Mobilization Committee called for massive protests, meetings, discussions, teach-ins and other actions on that day throughout the country to express the American people's opposition to the US government war policy and to demand a "peaceful withdrawal from Vietnam". Commenting on the proclamation, one of the members of the committee said confidently: "I expect that campuses will be closed down around the country." He was not mistaken.

On May 8, the number of universities and colleges on strike had reached 450. On that day, 100,000 young Americans arrived in Washington to take part in the national anti-war demonstration. They came to the White House and Capitol Hill in an unending stream closely hemmed in by police. In addition to the police force, 5,600 US Army troops were on the alert. A spokesman for the Pentagon declared at a press conference that the soldiers were provided with live ammunition. But the students, carrying lighted candles, anti-war posters and portraits of the students murdered at Kent, moved solemnly toward the armed soldiers and police. Many of the young men and women wore helmets and

carried gas masks to protect them from clubs and tear gas. A delegation from Kent marched through Washington with a red flag. This flag, the students declared, bears the blood of our comrades who perished defending peace and protecting America from shame. As in November 1969, the students carried black caskets through the capital with inscriptions of the names of American soldiers killed in Southeast Asia. A cardboard box was passed around into which young men dropped their draft cards for burning.

Similar demonstrations were held in other cities of the US, and in many places there were clashes with police and troops. In the State University at Buffalo, the police opened fire and ten persons were wounded. Tear gas was everywhere extensively used against students. Fires broke out on dozens of campuses, as a rule in military research centers and ROTC buildings. Thousands of demonstrators were arrested.

America's students had hardly had time to take off the armbands they had worn in mourning for the Kent four when new shots were fired by National Guardsmen, taking the lives of two black students of Jackson State College (Mississippi). Once again student America was stirred to anger. Only the end of the school year brought about a temporary lull on university campuses.

In the twelve months prior to the May events about a thousand demonstrations took place on more than 200 campuses in 37 states. And the 1969/70 academic year ended with the biggest anti-war political demonstration in the history of the country, culminating in a nation-wide student strike.

For student America it had been a year of growing up, being tempered and becoming politically mature. The "Leftist" tactics were failing. The road to be taken by real fighters diverged sharply from that of the Maoists, anarchists, Trotskyists, hippies, Yippies and the like who only play at social protest and speculate on the great and sacred cause of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society.



## AMERICA'S SHAME

Among the most visible manifestations of the deep crisis in which American democracy finds itself and which has such a detrimental effect upon the situation of young Americans are racial discrimination and segregation.

Segregation is the inexhaustible source which the ultra-Rightists use to nurture chauvinism in American youth. It was not surprising that some of the ideologists of German fascism stated openly that Hitlerism borrowed extensively from the ways of racial oppression in the United States. Rudolph Hess, for example, one of Hitler's top men, told a *New York Times* correspondent in August 1940, "We are very much like the Ku Klux Klan." The close relationship between Nazism and racial discrimination in the USA was pointed out by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois in his book *Color and Democracy*, where he wrote that the Negro problem "gives rein and legal recognition to race hatred, which the Nazis copied in their campaign against the Jews, establishing it on American lines of caste conditions, disfranchisement, mob murder, ridicule and public disparagement".

Contemporary racism in the United States is, of course, aimed not only against blacks and the 500,000 descendants of the aboriginal American Indians. Virtually all the national minorities in the country are the victims of racism; these include the majority of the 8 million Mexican-Americans and two million Puerto Ricans, many of the 10 million persons of Slav origin and three million Italians, and many others. But by far the largest group suffering from racism are the 25 million American blacks. That is why the struggle for black liberation, the struggle against racism, in the words of the US Communist Party Program, "is today the central, most crucial issue before the entire class and its allies".

The civil rights movement served as a hard school of class struggle not only for young men and women with dark skin but also for thousands of young American whites.

## FROM ILLUSION TO ACTION

For decades the US Establishment has been trying to sow illusions among the black population that the causes of segregation and racial discrimination do not lie in the capitalist system and are not a result of the monopolies' refusal to part with the additional billions of dollars of profit yielded by the super-exploitation of black labor. The Establishment view is that segregation and racial discrimination are a result of the racial prejudice of individual whites, mostly in the Deep South, and the absence of appropriate legislation to protect Negro rights.

American propaganda was not loth from time to time to rebuke some of the Southern states for not providing for the welfare and security of the black population. The South was contrasted with the North where blacks allegedly lived under freedom. This propaganda had a certain effect, and many blacks in the South, taking the myths that were spread at face value, hoped to gain freedom by migrating to the North.

The Establishment realized that the scope and nature of the civil rights movement depended to a large extent on whether black youth would participate or not. That was why it resorted to the tactic of partial reforms to draw young blacks away from the active struggle.

In the first half of 1950s, after the Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional, some measures were adopted which were supposed to improve the situation of American blacks. To what degree did these measures actually alter the situation of the black population? Arthur Schlesinger Jr., in his book *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (1965), wrote the following about segregation:

"Seven and a half years after the school desegregation decision, fewer than 13,000 Negro children in the South were attending school with white children, and more than

2,000 southern school districts were still wholly segregated, while the spread of *de facto* segregation . . . was actually reducing integration in northern schools. The right to vote?—still smothered in litigation and constitutional hair-splitting. Employment?—Negroes, still the last to be hired and the first to be fired, had an unemployment rate two and a half times that of whites. Housing?—still hopeless. The federal government?—still subsidizing discrimination through a wide range of federal programs, and still incapable . . . of protecting Negroes in the exercise of their constitutional rights in the South. The Emancipation proclamation?—a hundred years gone, and the Negro still in bondage.”

Under President Kennedy, racial discrimination was ruled to be contrary to law. The Civil Rights Bill, signed by Johnson in 1964, prohibited racial discrimination in employment and vocational training programs. But these laws are constantly violated. Suffice it to say that labor union vocational training system, primarily required by young workers, was extended to only something like three per cent of blacks in a number of industries. The civil rights legislation did nothing to improve the material conditions of life for young blacks, nor did it lead to any noticeable broadening of their social and political rights.

The situation as it stood after the adoption of these laws was quite clearly described by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Nixon administration, James Farmer.

In 1966, when Farmer was not yet a government official but a leader in the black movement and president of the Congress of Racial Equality, he noted that civil rights legislation alone was insufficient; providing black people with equal rights and even with equal opportunities, but not creating social conditions befitting a human being, meant playing the same cruel joke that the rulers of America have been playing on poor people throughout American history.

American propaganda to the effect that life is more promising for blacks in the North also proved to be a cruel joke. This was borne out by the continuous black youth rebellions in the ghettos of northern cities as in New York, Chicago and Washington.

In order to become aware of the racial problem in the above-mentioned cities, one has only to walk the length of any of their central streets and avenues. Super-modern buildings of glass and aluminum, fashionable stores, expensive restaurants and hotels—suddenly all this disappears. Luxury is replaced by two- or three-storeyed run-down houses. Instead of the large and fashionable stores, there are small shops. The street becomes dirty and dim. As the appearance of the street changes, so do the people. There are fewer and fewer passersby with white skin, and after a while none at all. You are in a neighborhood inhabited by blacks or some other minority group.

I happened to visit a black ghetto in Chicago on a Sunday, a day when a considerable part of the district is transformed into a flea market. It was hard to resist the temptation to take a few pictures. And it is hard to believe that these shots had been taken in a highly developed country like the United States. In terms of the atmosphere and the kind of merchandise sold, this part of the ghetto looked more like a market in some Eastern country where the temperature had suddenly dropped and people were forced to put on the first warm clothing they could get their hands on. Next to some of the sellers were metal barrels, and thick smoke came out of them because all sorts of odds and ends were burned to keep the people warm. Everything imaginable was on sale there—fruits, vegetables, records, brooms, spare parts from old used cars, home-made toys, candy—everything. And business was brisk because just about everything one needed could be bought here at a low price. Apparently, the lauded American “affluence”, “prosperity”, and “welfare” had not yet reached this part of Lyndon Johnson’s promised Great Society.

The economic, political and social oppression of blacks could not but result in the strong upsurge in the movement for the freedom and equality of the black population which marked the sixties and the movement’s even greater scope at the present time.

The resolution of the 18th National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, on the Negro Question reads in part:

“The first half of the sixties marked a historic turning point in the freedom struggles of the Negro people. History



had placed the ending of the whole system of jim-crow oppression and segregation on the agenda. . . . The movement for freedom and equality has become the most potent, the most militant and the most dynamic protest of our time."

An important factor contributing to the potent, militant and dynamic nature of the movement for the freedom and equality of the black population is the active role played in it by youth. A great moral impetus to the movement was provided by the centenary of the Civil War. Looking back, many Americans began to realize that only the forms of oppression had changed as a result of the Civil War—slave labor had been transformed into hired labor—but the motives for oppression had remained the same, linked as they were with exploitation.

The victory of the Cuban revolution was another important historical and moral factor which contributed to the growth of the national liberation movement of the American Negro people and stimulated youth participation in this movement. The experience gained and methods used in the resolution of the nationalities question in Cuba helped the young members of the civil rights movement understand that the Negro freedom struggle should not be aimed at the integration of blacks in the American way of life (the aim pursued by the leadership of the movement for many decades with no significant results), but should rather resolutely reject this way of life.

The growth of the movement was also accelerated as a result of the policies of the Kennedy administration which pretended to cooperate with black leaders, drew attractive prospects for solving the race problem, but actually proceeded extremely slowly and irresolutely.

What was required in view of the foregoing were resolute and concrete actions, and it was only because such actions were taken that the struggle for civil rights has become the important mass movement for democracy it is today. As Gus Hall said at the 18th National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, this struggle "has created political ferment. It has been a factor in raising to a new level the mass political consciousness of large sections of our people". Many active members of the movement to stop the war in Vietnam, the movement for civil liberties went through the school of struggle for the civil rights of the blacks,

in the course of which they realized the need to fight for the freedom of all Americans, not only black Americans. This is especially true of American youth and students, many of whom came face to face with the actual situation of black people for the first time when they travelled to the South to participate directly in the struggle for civil rights.

Direct and lively contact with the people, especially with the poorest sections of the population, has a favorable influence on the direction and nature of the activity of American students, prompting them to play a bigger and more active role in the struggle for democracy. The finest of the students who went through the school of struggle for civil rights now comprise the nucleus of democratic organizations of American youth.

Millions of young men, black and white, take part in the struggle against discrimination in housing, employment, transportation and education and against police brutality. A most active role in the struggle for civil rights is played by black youth. The entire civil rights movement is now headed by talented leaders who emerged from among black youth in the course of the struggle. An increasing number of working-class youth is taking part in the movement; in fact 80 per cent of the black youth in the movement are workers.

Participation of American youth in the civil rights movement in the postwar period has its history. Suffice it to recall the events of 1956 at the University of Alabama when the state authorities and the university administration did not allow Autherine Lucy to attend classes solely because of the color of her skin. Or the autumn events of 1957 in Little Rock when nine black students were barred from an all-white school.

These and similar facts dispelled the illusions among American youth to the effect that the Supreme Court decisions on desegregation would be implemented with hardly any efforts. Youth passed from illusion to action.

#### **"FREEDOM NOW!"**

It was noted at the 18th National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, that for the young Negro starting an independent life during the civil rights struggle the "Freedom

Now!" slogan is particularly important since it signifies freedom in his lifetime.

Young blacks are becoming increasingly aware that neither government measures nor the promises and declarations of the liberal-minded bourgeoisie will bring genuine freedom and equality to black people, that freedom and equality can be won only through persistent, day-to-day struggle. The last decade provided many graphic illustrations of the political activation of black youth.

On February 1, 1960, black students of the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College in Greensboro staged a sit-in at a lunch counter after being refused service.

Within a matter of a few months the protest campaign spread to parks, theaters, restaurants, buses, libraries, churches, swimming pools, etc. It involved a large number of American colleges, and support for the students of the South came from all parts of the country. The American press commented: "Not since the late 1930's and early 1940's when campuses were swept by concern for the New Deal and world peace, has any issue or idea so aroused American students."

During the 18 months following the first sit-in at the Greensboro lunch counter, similar protest actions involving up to 70,000 persons, took place in over a hundred towns and cities; a total of 3,600 students and supporters were arrested, and many students were expelled and teachers fired from universities for participating in these sit-ins.

Following the sit-ins at lunch counters and other public places came the famous Freedom Rides. On May 4, 1961, a group of young people, both black and white, organized by the Congress of Racial Equality, left Washington, D.C., aboard two buses for New Orleans (Louisiana). This was the first of a number of such trips made to challenge the segregationist barriers in inter-state bus travel, since throughout the South almost all bus stations had segregated waiting-rooms and lunch-rooms. The racists and police rose up against the Freedom Riders, threatening them, beating them, and burning their buses. But with every act of violence the number of students taking part in the Freedom Rides rose.

A real battle between racists and civil rights fighters took

place on the campus of the University of Mississippi. In 1962, James Meredith, a young black man who had served nine years in the US Air Force, submitted an application for admission to that university. In it he wrote: "With all of the occurring events regarding changes in our educational system taking place in our country in this new age, I feel certain that this application does not come as a surprise to you. I certainly hope that this matter will be handled in a manner that will be complimentary to the University and to the State of Mississippi. Of course, I am the one that will, no doubt, suffer the greatest consequences of this event."

In the latter conjecture, James Meredith was not mistaken. He was the first black student to enter the university. The state authorities and university administration were unwilling to break with their segregationist traditions. When Meredith appeared on campus guarded by police, student racists staged a demonstration under the slogan "Glory, Glory, Segregation", and the Governor of Mississippi, Ross Barnett, solemnly read a declaration refusing to accept Meredith to the university.

Racist emotions ran high. A "We Hate Kennedy" call was sounded at the university because Kennedy had expressed his support of Meredith's legitimate desire. A French journalist and a resident of Oxford were killed and 300 persons wounded in the course of clashes provoked by racists. During his entire nine months' stay at the university, Meredith had to be escorted by armed guards.

James Meredith's courageous action was like a signal for activating broad student participation in the campaign for the desegregation and in the fight to secure the constitutional rights of the black population of the South. But the movement for the freedom and equality of the black population was not strong enough yet, and its members had to concentrate their efforts on only certain kinds of action in areas which were the main centers of racism, segregation and inhuman living conditions for the black population. These included: Mississippi, where former NAACP leader Medgar Evers was murdered and where James Meredith was wounded by a bullet fired by a racist; Birmingham, Alabama, which became a notorious symbol of segregation and where, in addition to other murders committed by racists,



a bomb thrown by racists into a church killed four little children, but none of the murders was even investigated; and Dallas, Texas, the center for ultra-Rightist organizations opposing desegregation.

What kind of work did progressive American youth carry on in these hotbeds of racism? For a number of years, hundreds of young men and women came to various parts of the State of Mississippi during their summer vacations. One thing they did was to organize freedom schools, which was particularly important for Mississippi where the law did not provide for compulsory education and the rate of illiteracy was especially high. Moreover a considerable number of children there could attend school only during the summer because in spring and fall they had to work on the cotton plantations. The freedom schools suffered a shortage of books, school supplies and classrooms; in fact, most of the classes had to be held outdoors. But the schools functioned nonetheless. The students, now turned teachers, not only taught the children how to read and write, but also sought to point out the defects of the system existing in the country and the reasons for poverty and racial discrimination. The school programs included stories about the life of blacks in the North, about poor blacks and poor whites, about the civil rights movement, about the power structure in the country, about the history of the black people and about African culture. These programs were intended to overcome still existing feelings of racial inferiority, to show the importance of unity between poor white people and black people in the fight against the ills of modern American society, to help people overcome fear, to show them the illusory nature of dreams of a better life in the North, and to convince them of the need to struggle for a better life and for freedom and democracy at home.

Another widespread form of student participation in the civil rights movement was the campaign for the registration of black voters under the principle "One man—one vote!"

It is hard to overestimate the political significance of this campaign. It was directly linked with the struggle to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the southern states, a struggle which began more than a hundred years ago but had never terminated because of the resistance of

reactionary forces. The Supreme Court had handed down a number of decisions to the effect that the black population should be given the opportunity to exercise its constitutional right to vote. The Commission on Civil Rights proposed that federal examiners supervise the registration of all voters. But the solutions and propositions remained merely on paper. The state authorities simply crossed out the names of black people from the voting lists. This was not only rabid racism; it was a deliberate policy aimed at the curtailment and abolition of bourgeois-democratic institutions.

In a number of Southern states local legislative bodies use the so-called veto by which candidates who are too democratically oriented or have taken part in the struggle for the freedom and equality of the black population are simply prevented from assuming the office to which they have been elected. Thus, in the mid-sixties, Julian Bond, a young civil rights leader in the South, was twice elected by the voters and twice prevented by the state legislative from assuming office.

The fact that 500,000 blacks had been registered by the end of 1964 may be regarded as a great achievement of the civil rights movement.

A greater part of the work in voter-registration was carried out by youth. They had to work under the most difficult conditions. For example, in Albany, Georgia, the students taking part in the campaign suffered arrests and beatings from the very outset. But they did not retreat. Nor did they retreat when a number of the leaders of the civil rights movement were sentenced to prison, or when false rumors were spread about them, or when they were threatened with violence. But in many instances they found it very difficult to overcome the fear and other consequences of segregation felt by the people they were there to help. Because they had been intimidated and threatened with the loss of their jobs or a cut in wages if they registered, many of the local black citizens not only refused to register but even avoided speaking with the participants of the drive. The students often had to make repeated visits to the same homes before they could convince the people living there that they should register. Many did not register because they were afraid of the literacy test. Special schools had to be set up where the students could teach members of the black

population the fundamentals of political science, economics, international relations and often even elementary reading and writing so they could fill in the registration blank.

The student voter-registration drives saw many dramatic events. Here is but one of them.

In March 1965, the students taking part in the voter registration drive in Selma, Alabama, decided to hold a demonstration in Montgomery, the state capital, and present the governor with the demand to secure "for all citizens the right to vote". The demonstration was dispersed.

The dispersal served as a signal for fresh action. Civil rights fighters began to arrive in Alabama from all over the United States. They organized a protest march from Selma to Montgomery, which ended in a demonstration at the state capitol in which 25,000 young Americans took part.

The events in Alabama lent added impetus to the involvement of youth in the civil rights movement. Discussing the events at Selma, Greg Lipscomb, a student at the University of Texas, said: "America learned more in Selma than the plight of voter rights. It found a new classroom, an exposure to instruction diametrically opposed to all it had known. It caused one to question the realism of our curriculum. Somehow, this most important of social events, the Selma experience, has been left out. We have forgotten that America began as a group of revolutionaries, shedding their hesitations to stand up and march in defiance of all that was around them."

The events in Selma had repercussions in many American universities. Students held meetings and demonstrations protesting the "brutality in Selma".

The summer of 1966 was marked by turbulent events when racists made an attempt on the life of James Meredith in the state of Mississippi. Hundreds of American students reacted by joining the civil rights movement. To suppress the growing movement for the freedom and equality of the black population, the ruling circles and reactionary forces began to resort more frequently to methods of police repression, political assassinations and bloody reprisals.

In February 1968, the state authorities of South Carolina staged a bloody suppression of the students of the Negro college in Orangeburg, in the course of which three persons

were killed, fifty wounded and dozens beaten and arrested. In April 1968, to suppress demonstrations provoked by the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, besides local police forces, about 22,000 US Army troops and over 30,000 National Guardsmen were called out. Violent repressive measures against blacks were taken in 131 American cities. Several dozen persons were killed, 3,500 wounded and over 15,000 arrested. Most of the victims were black youth.

In 1969-70, the leaders and members of the Black Panther Party became the target of brutal police and racist repression. In a short period of time, 28 prominent leaders of the Party were killed and hundreds of its members were thrown into prison. A *New York Times* correspondent who visited the local party headquarters in Berkeley was surprised to learn that most of the members there were women and young girls. That's because all the men are in jail or in a cemetery—was the answer to his query.

In spite of widespread repression, the participation of youth in the civil rights movement grew from year to year and assumed more militant forms. American propaganda sought to justify the brutal methods used in quelling black unrest by saying that they were provoked by the violence of the "black rebels". But the facts told a different story. They showed that the upsurge of the civil rights movement in the first half of the sixties took the form of "dynamic non-violence", as preached by Dr. Martin Luther King, who himself became the victim of brutal violence as did hundreds of other fighters for civil rights. Driven to desperation, blacks, and particularly young blacks, went out into the streets meeting violence with violence. The ghetto rebellions were often spontaneous and unorganized. But on the whole the movement for the freedom and equality of the black population entered a more advanced stage, especially in the second half of the sixties.

What was qualitatively new in the movement was that it went beyond the limits of protest action by liberals, both white and black, who were trying to gain concessions by "legal" means only. The initiative passed into the hands of the black population, from which the now recognized leaders of the movement emerged. The movement of the black people for their rights became the largest part of the present general democratic movement in America.



Young people have contributed many new features to the civil rights movement, to its tactic and methods of struggle. The demand for "Black Power" originated among youth. For most of them the demand for Black Power has a democratic content; it represents the struggle for such changes in the structure of modern American society as would guarantee the social, political and economic freedom and complete equality to the black population. At the same time, a certain part of the movement interprets this slogan in a nationalistic sense, speaking of an exclusively "black revolution" and of "hatred for the white man", thereby drawing attention away from the main causes of segregation and racial discrimination which lie within the capitalist system.

Negatively affecting the civil rights movement is a certain lack of unity, for besides its basic democratic wing, the movement also contains segregationist, conciliatory and separationist elements.

The segregationists favor the separation of races in the United States. These people, led by some black capitalists and encouraged by the reactionaries of the Southern states, advocate the preservation of "racial purity" and the separate development of white and black cultures. They consider the existing race relations natural and necessary.

The conciliatory trend is made up of the afore-mentioned advocates of exclusively "legal" methods of struggle.

The separatists are for the complete isolation of American blacks from the rest of the American nation and even speak in terms of setting up an independent state. The main force in this trend are the Black Muslims, whose ideology and practice are based on the Islamic faith and extreme nationalism.

The democratic wing of the civil rights movement, although employing a variety of tactics, is united by the desire to achieve for the black population full economic, political and social equality and to eradicate the causes of segregation and racial discrimination.

The majority of the young members of the civil rights movement belong to the democratic wing. It is utterly false to say that the most consistent young fighters for the freedom and equality of the black population display reactionary nationalism simply because they defend their racial dignity, are proud of the history of the black people in the United

States, and declare with pride that "black is beautiful and it is beautiful to be black". This is not nationalism but a feeling of genuine pride in belonging to one's people and a feeling of deep faith in it. These are the young militants who are becoming more politically conscious and are realizing the need not only to wage a struggle against racial segregation but also against the various aspects of modern America which lie at the root of the oppression of the black population. This is borne out, in particular, by the increased interweaving and merging of the struggle for civil rights with the fight against the aggressive foreign policy of American imperialism.

## CONFRONTATION—MILITARISM VS ANTI-MILITARISM

American propaganda and many US politicians admit the fact that never in the history of their country did the anti-war movement reach such proportions as in 1971-72. This was so primarily because of the escalation of the war in Indochina and its negative effect upon the position of segments of the US youth-generation, including young (and especially black) workers, students and young intellectuals. In fact, there was no segment of the young generation of any appreciable size in the US that did not feel the full impact of the social and economic consequences of the aggressive foreign policy of American imperialism and its dirty war in Indochina. That was the objective basis of the mass anti-war movement of American youth.

As early as 1966, in his report to the 18th National Convention of the Communist Party, Gus Hall pointed out that in recent years "the anti-war demonstration has become a part of the American scene. The totality of this movement reaches out to and speaks for the millions, and involves a whole new force of organizers and dedicated peace advocates. This is most apparent in the role of the women and youth. And it is a major feature of the new political development of our people". "With the birth of the 'teach-in'," he said further, "the academic communities reached out to the public, and the professor and student came to the forefront."

The stagnant, silent days of McCarthyism, when American youth and students accepted the aggressive policies of American imperialism without a sound, were gone.

## PRODUCING SOLDIERS

As pointed out frequently by Lenin, young people have always figured prominently in the plans by imperialist reaction and the military as they prepared for new wars.

Any army is necessarily made up basically of young men; hence it is especially in young people that the imperialist circles seek to develop the spirit of chauvinism.

They try to cultivate feelings of hostility for other peoples—particularly toward those who have embarked on a non-capitalist road of development or are fighting for their national liberation—and also hatred of everything that bourgeois propaganda brands as "communist".

Imperialism and reaction use every means possible to win the active support of youth for their policies, always trying to exploit for this purpose the sentiments and specific characteristics of youth, and particularly, as Georgi Dimitrov noted in the report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, "the very acute need of the youth for militant activity".

The US ruling circles also seek to make use of this "militancy" among the youth. They would like to channel it in the direction of militarism, put it to work in producing soldiers for aggressive wars.

Immediately after the Second World War, the American reactionary and military circles, in hatching out their aggressive plans, launched a wide chauvinistic propaganda campaign among youth. Appealing to the fighting spirit of youth they tried to captivate it with militaristic romanticism. They did everything to popularize service and extol the merits of the American fighting man. Military training was stepped up among youth all along the line, beginning with the schools and the Boy Scouts and ending with the colleges and organizations for older youth. Government officials and military men used educational establishments as a platform for delivering jingoistic speeches. At many colleges courses dealing with a social strategy for the war against the Soviet Union or psychological methods of waging war were introduced.



Subsequent events only confirmed that the US ruling circles wanted to create in young people a frame of mind favorable to militarism and war.

American imperialism and the military seek to militarize American youth from childhood. Many army and other periodicals emphasize that the process of preparing the American soldier for his important role begins long before he takes his oath—at school, in church, on the play-ground and at home—for it is then that the future soldier develops those qualities that are needed for successful performance on the battlefield. Some American philosophers and sociologists even recommend that children should be taken in hand before they reach intellectual maturity and develop the ability for critical thought, and taught what and whom they should be loyal to and how.

In many schools and colleges a system of direct military training is used to spread militaristic ideas among students.

In 1964, 300 American high schools had in their curriculum a special military training program worked out by the Pentagon. Schools offering this program are supplied with teachers and instructors, uniforms, weapons and equipment, that is, everything necessary for military training—all free of charge. The Pentagon also issues a special guidebook for school principals, calling upon them to advertize military service, to use the services of various veterans' organizations for this purpose, to accept reserve or retired officers as teachers, and so forth.

The process of bringing up killers, which begins at school, assumes the most sinister forms after the young American is drafted into the army. There the soldier is taught to look on with indifference while people are wounded and killed; there all human feelings are smothered and soldiers are turned into armed robots.

Military training is also a part of higher education in the United States and is effected through units of the ROTC, mentioned above, whose history dates back to 1862. For over a century the ROTC program was compulsory at all state universities. But even after it was made an elective in some universities, the importance attached to the ROTC as a source of reserve officers has not diminished.

The ROTC program is designed to train officers for the army, air force and navy. After a student has completed

the full army program he is usually commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Reserve. During his studies the ROTC student is provided with textbooks, uniform and the necessary military training equipment free of charge by military agencies.

The ROTC courses comprise a four-year program, during which the basic military-tactical sciences and also military history, problems of national security and international relations are studied. The latter, as stated in the ROTC program, is necessary in order to orient the future officer in geographic and economic factors and their influence on the division of people into nations and on the origin of wars. Twice in the course of the program the students are sent to military camps for training for periods of from four to six weeks.

Besides the propaganda describing the advantages of military service, certain economic factors are used to attract students to the ROTC. For example, students undergoing advanced ROTC instruction (third and fourth year) receive \$40 a month from the US armed forces. During their first stay at a military camp they get about \$120 and during the second—\$180.

In addition, military agencies grant scholarships to students. In 1968, 5,500 students received scholarships from the army alone. Such scholarships provide the student with free food and free tuition.

The ROTC courses are permeated with unconcealed anti-communism. They are built around the notion that the United States carries the major burden in the sublime mission of protecting "freedom and democracy" from the aggressive policy allegedly pursued by the Soviet Union and "international communism". This fully corresponds with the formula of one of the leading theoreticians of anti-communism, J. Edgar Hoover, who publicly declared that none other than God Himself has chosen the American people as His instrument for victory over world communism.

The poisoning of American youth with the spirit of chauvinism and the stifling of their democratic inclinations was furthered by the wave of McCarthyism that swept the country.

By concerted effort, monopoly capital, the ruling circles and the reactionary forces of the country succeeded for a

time in getting a considerable part of American youth to actively support their aggressive foreign policy. Another large segment of youth, the core of the so-called silent generation, remained, for reasons discussed earlier, politically inert.

Even such events as the aggression of American imperialism in Korea did not evoke any protest on the part of any sizable segments of American youth. Interesting in this regard is an episode described in *History and Development of USNSA* by Edward Garvey, a former president of that organization and later the secretary-general of the International Student Conference. The delegates to the Third National Student Congress, which took place in 1950, refused to give the floor to an observer from the Labor Youth League because there was reason to believe that he would bring up the question of the US aggression in Korea. When after prolonged debate the LYL representative was finally granted ten minutes for his speech he "quickly changed from student problems to a general tirade on how Northern Korea had been invaded. He was met with stony, unbroken silence . . . his most vehement denunciations did not bring a murmur of expected response from his audience". Moreover, the NSA leadership availed itself of the International Union of Students' denunciation of the use of bacteriological weapons by American imperialism in Korea as a pretext to effect a total break with the student organizations of the socialist countries and the democratic international student movement.

What a great psychological trauma was experienced by American youth as a result of the aggressive imperialist policy, the crisis of bourgeois democracy and the crisis in all spheres of social life! What courage it took on the part of progressive American youth to be the first to challenge the existing system in the country! What difficulties have to be overcome by the young men and women taking part in the democratic movements in the USA today!

The propaganda of chauvinism, militarism and ultra-patriotism became particularly strong in connection with the aggression of American imperialism against the people of Vietnam.

As president of Columbia University, General Dwight D. Eisenhower told the students there that they were all his

soldiers and called upon them to be ready for sacrifice in war, which, he said, was the main instrument of national policy. Lyndon Johnson, although he was never a general, called upon American youth to give their blood and lives not in word but in deed when he unleashed the aggressive war in Vietnam. Without batting an eye he said that he "would like the youth of America to develop as much enthusiasm about the war (in Vietnam) as youth in Germany did about Hitler's wars".

When, however, youth do not exhibit such enthusiasm they are accused of cowardice, and they are confronted with propaganda that play upon their patriotic feelings. As noted above, such feelings have been cultivated by bourgeois propaganda over a period of many, many years and are quite strong in the American people as a whole.

Yet in spite of all the difficulties, the movement against the war in Vietnam gained momentum with every year.

#### AGAINST DEATH IN THE WAR OF THE RICH

Despite the extensive propaganda of militarism and chauvinism, American imperialism never succeeded in completely stamping out anti-war and anti-militaristic attitudes of American youth. Even in the hottest periods of the Cold War and when McCarthyism was rampant, young people participated in such activities as the peace movement, the movement to outlaw nuclear weapons, the drives to collect signatures to the Peace Pact and the Stockholm Appeal, and the protests against the arrest of Dr. Du Bois for his anti-war activities. There were youth and student demonstrations for an end to the war in Korea, against compulsory ROTC courses, etc. But these actions were not of a mass character; only small groups of progressive youth and students took part in them.

The upsurge in the movement for peace among American youth dates from the early sixties. At first the movement was of an abstract nature, amounting mainly to a criticism of militaristic tendencies. Many of its members felt that the defense of peace was a course pursued in common by the American people and its government.

A crisis in the ranks of the peace movement arose in con-



nection with the blockade of Cuba. This aggressive action of the US government shook the faith in a "common peace policy". Many members of the older generation who were used to regarding the peace movement as a "common cause", felt they had to support Kennedy's policy at a time of "national crisis", in spite of the fact that they were critical of the show of strength in the Caribbean. This view was based on the belief that the Cuban crisis was merely an aspect of the conflict between the USA and USSR as the leading world powers and that its solution should be sought in the restoration of the balance of power. Those who opposed the blockade soon came to understand and to support the right of the Cuban people to settle their political, social and economic problems independently without any interference in their domestic affairs by the United States. In addition, the Cuban revolution showed the young members of the peace movement that even the people of such a small country as Cuba could take their fate into their own hands.

The groups that spoke out against the blockade and its consequences constituted the nucleus of a rapidly growing genuinely democratic anti-war movement. The pattern of the development of the Cuban crisis made many people realize that the reason for the existing threat of war—usually made out by American propaganda to be connected with the "communist menace"—was really connected with the economic and political interests of US imperialism abroad and the desire to preserve them by any means including military force.

The Cuban crisis of 1962 convinced young Americans in the peace movement that to wage an effective struggle against war, the threat of war and for world peace, they must come out against these American interests and the policy and actions based on such interests.

The peace movement passed from the abstract stage to the concrete stage. From the struggle against the Cuban blockade, American youth gained experience that contributed substantially to the creation of mass opposition to the aggression of American imperialism in Vietnam.

Since the war directly affected the lives of young people most of all it was only natural that it was young people who constituted the main force of the massive anti-war movement that developed in the USA.

It would be wrong to think that the movement immediately or even ultimately, in the course of its development, assumed an organized nature. On the contrary, for a time, spontaneous protest against the war was characteristic of the majority of young Americans. This was due to the fact that the motives for participation in the anti-war movement were mostly personal. This was clearly seen in the ways of expressing opposition to the war. The most widespread was the desire to avoid the draft. Hence the simulated illnesses at draft board medical examinations, the increase in early marriages, deliberate failure at tests for draftees. A large number of boys tried to avoid registering at their draft boards upon reaching the age of 18. The matter assumed such proportions that columnist Drew Pearson wrote of the emergence of "a generation of draft dodgers" in the United States.

Senator Thomas Dodd was quite explicit on this issue when he declared that the anti-draft movement had to be crushed or it would "spread like wildfire", as he put it.

Other ways of expressing one's opposition to the US war in Vietnam included conscientious objection; refusal to obey draft laws; political debates and criticism of government policies through the mass media; public demonstrations against the war; support of the National Liberation Front; and self-immolation.

At the early stages, passive forms of expressing opposition to the war prevailed, because, as the 18th Communist Party National Convention noted, "anti-imperialist consciousness is not yet what stirs the broadest sections of the opposition to the war of aggression against Vietnam".

But that consciousness grew as the anti-war movement developed and its individual groups and members began to unite for joint action. Participation in any form of anti-war protest objectively contributed to a growth of anti-imperialist consciousness both of individuals and of the whole anti-war movement.

This process can be traced, for example, in the protest of American youth against the draft. The draft bore upon the interests of virtually all strata of the young generation and clearly reflected the class, anti-democratic nature of the war against the Vietnamese people. The nature of the draft

revealed to American youth that in "the war of the rich" in Vietnam it was primarily working-class youth and young men from the ghettos who had to die for interests that are alien to them.

The class nature of the war was reflected in the fact that the armed forces recruited mostly working-class youth, its poorest sections, which, having lost all illusions and hope, look upon the army as a means of avoiding the plight of unemployment and life in the slums. The American press has often noted that the areas with the highest unemployment in the country are also the areas with the highest rate of army inductions. The class approach to army recruiting has also been attested to by many prominent American journalists. James Reston of the *New York Times*, for one, has written: "...most of the foot soldiers come from poor families that could not afford to send their sons to college, and of course, many of the drop-outs have dropped right into Vietnam."

The drafting of black Americans was even more indicative of the class nature of the war. An increase in the draft quota has frequently been suggested as a solution to the problem of the black ghettos, where there is increasing turbulence among youth and often as much as half the residents are unemployed. It has also been proposed to lower the requirements for army induction in order to enlist large numbers of young people from the ghettos. According to official statistics 15 per cent of American soldiers are blacks, but many American observers consider this figure to be an underestimate. Some of the leaders of the movement for the freedom and equality of the black population maintain that about 40 per cent of the Americans fighting in Vietnam were blacks who were used there as cannon fodder merely because they had no education and enjoyed no privileges.

Thus, the draft is used by American imperialism as a means of discrimination against the poor, the unemployed and the young people living in ghettos.

But as American imperialism sank deeper into the quagmire of its Indochina adventure, it was inevitable that the war would begin to seriously affect also the middle strata of the American population and above all its student youth.

Up to a certain time students were exempt from the draft

since college studies were regarded as an important part of the country's defense. But with every passing day the escalation of the war required new contingents of troops to be sent to Indochina. Working-class youth and youth from the ghettos were no longer sufficient to provide for the army of aggression. Students were often drafted into the army. For them the aggression became not only a moral issue based on compassion for the peoples of Indochina, but also a real personal problem.

The first students to be drafted under the pretext of bad marks or violation of academic discipline were those who took an active part in politics. In his time, Lenin assailed the tsarist autocracy for taking 183 students of the Kiev University into the army for "riotous assembly". The methods of modern American imperialism are little different from those used by the tsarist regime over 70 years ago. In today's United States, the words "Put the drill sergeant in place of Voltaire!" are fully relevant. The formula is not at all outdated; in fact, it was the 20th century that was destined to see its actual application.

This, then, is one of the manifestations of the undemocratic nature of the draft. But the most important reason why it is anti-democratic is that it is unconstitutional since there is no law for compulsory military service in the United States. The law which provides for conscription only in the event that the security of the country is in danger was also flagrantly violated. Under an undeclared war, what was essentially universal compulsory military service was introduced in the country, something American youth had been fighting against for many years, even in the stagnant fifties.

The undemocratic, discriminatory and class nature of the draft is becoming increasingly apparent to many young Americans. Resistance to the draft objectively furthered anti-imperialist attitudes among youth and their transition from individual passive forms of protest to active and organized protest against the aggression of American imperialism.

#### AN ACT OF HONOR AND COURAGE

Many young Americans were coming to see their patriotic duty in the struggle to stop the aggression in Indochina. When a young American said, "I won't go to Vietnam!",



knowing that because of his stand he would be expelled from college or fired from his job and thrown into prison for five years—this is active protest. And such protest was increasing among American youth. One of the active forms of opposition to the aggression was the burning of draft cards in public, which became so widespread that the US Congress was compelled to pass a bill making this act an offense punishable by fine and imprisonment.

An important event that lent added impetus to the anti-war protest by American youth took place in June 1966, when three American servicemen—Private First Class James Johnson and Privates David Samas and Dennis Mora—refused to obey an order sending them to Vietnam, despite the threat of being court-martialed. They motivated their action by saying that “the Viet Cong obviously had the moral and physical support of most of the peasantry who were fighting for their independence”. They refused to take part in the war. Their public declaration ended in the following words: “We have made our decision. We will not be a part of this unjust, immoral, and illegal war. We want no part of a war of extermination. We oppose the criminal waste of American lives and resources. We refuse to go to Vietnam!”

Johnson, Samas and Mora were court-martialed. The first two were sentenced to five years of hard labor, the latter to three years. These active fighters against the US aggression in Vietnam were hidden away behind prison bars, but the ruling circles could not smother the response that their courageous act evoked among America's youth. The National Youth Conference of the CPUSA declared: “In many ways it can be said that the Fort Hood Three case is as crucial to the direction of the country as the Scottsboro Boys [case] was in mobilizing the forces of conscience against racism in the 1930s.”

The trial of the Fort Hood servicemen had a great impact on public opinion. At press conferences and in the course of the trial Johnson, Mora and Samas definitely showed that their case was not exceptional, that the war was becoming increasingly unpopular among servicemen, “that after seven months in the army it was their opinion that a majority of the soldiers do not believe in the war but feel trapped and helpless. Our democracy is not vital enough to encourage its

citizens to believe that they can decide for themselves such an important matter as whether or not to risk their lives suppressing the independence of the Vietnamese”. Such feelings on the part of a large number of servicemen provided an objective basis for establishing cooperation between soldiers and the peace movement, and the Johnson-Mora-Samas trial contributed in some degree to the realization of this possibility in that it led many American soldiers once again to ponder over the nature of the war being waged by American imperialism in Vietnam.

The Fort Hood prisoners themselves illustrate to a certain extent the general evolution of views among American soldiers concerning the nature of the war and the need to struggle against it.

James Johnson, a twenty-year-old black youth, came from New York's East Harlem and had attended Bronx Community College before being inducted into the army.

Dennis Mora, a twenty-five-year-old Puerto Rican, was also from Harlem, but from the Spanish part, and had a BA in history, from the City College of New York.

David Samas, a twenty-year-old white of Italian and Lithuanian descent, was born in Chicago and had been a student at Modesto Junior College in California.

Before the army, only one of them—Dennis Mora was a member of the Du Bois Clubs—had been active in political movements.

These young Americans, who differ in origin, in the color of their skin, and in political views, were drawn together in the militant anti-war movement. This is the logical path of development for young, intellectually alert Americans who come to believe less and less in official propaganda and want to discover for themselves the causes of the crisis of modern American society.

The ethnic makeup of the Fort Hood Three was a graphic demonstration of the possibility and the need for unity between whites, blacks and Spanish-speaking people in the struggle to end the war in Vietnam as well as in the civil rights movement. The trial not only helped people realize the necessity for close cooperation between these movements, but actually strengthened that cooperation. Actively joining a campaign in defense of the prisoners of Fort Hood, in addition to organizations struggling for peace and an end

to the war in Vietnam, were the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Representatives of both CORE and SNCC were included in the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee. The SNCC statement on the arrest of the three servicemen read: "The fact that two of the arrested soldiers were non-white, serves to underscore the growing awareness among non-whites in this country that they must begin to resist the efforts of the national government to use them as cannon fodder for racist oppression around the world." SNCC called upon the civil rights movement "to rise to the defense of these courageous soldiers, in support actions around the South".

Hard labor failed to break the spirit of the three courageous young Americans. Upon being released from prison, they once again plunged into the movement, devoting much of their time and energy to mobilizing American youth for the struggle to end the aggression against the Vietnamese people, to bring about the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, and against the draft for the army of aggression.

In March 1969, I visited the national headquarters of the Du Bois Clubs of America in New York. Inside, my attention was attracted by what looked like a timetable, which covered half a wall and had some kind of entries written on it. This proved to be a schedule of events in which Johnson, Mora and Samas participated. It showed that in February 1969 alone they took part in 38 meetings, demonstrations and other anti-war activities in various parts of the country.

The action taken by Johnson, Mora and Samas was not without its effect on other young Americans. It stimulated a growth in the movement against the war and the draft. Even J. Edgar Hoover admitted that Johnson, Mora and Samas were not alone.

At the end of the summer of 1967, the example of the Fort Hood Three was followed by Ronald Lockman, a black member of the Du Bois Clubs of America. The campaign in his defense reached such proportions that the authorities were forced to reduce the prison term from five years, as provided by law, to two and a half years.

Some idea of the growing anti-war sentiments among

American soldiers can be gleaned from the following facts.

Whereas in 1965, the number of persons sentenced for breaking draft laws was 262, in 1966 it was 450. And in 1967, 952 persons were sentenced for refusing to serve in the army fighting in Vietnam. There were also about 10,000 potential young prisoners in Canada evading the draft, and several hundred servicemen who deserted from the US army sought political asylum in other countries.

According to *The New York Times*, 73,000 men deserted from the US army in 1969. Servicemen began to take an active part in the anti-war movement. American soldiers in full uniform joined the ranks of anti-war demonstrators for the first time in April 1969, during demonstrations in New York. By April 1970, it was already a question of setting up a national anti-war organization of servicemen which would fight for an end to the war, coordinate the anti-war activities of soldiers, and give financial support to soldiers' newspapers and servicemen on trial.

#### CONCERNING EVERYONE

The great upsurge in anti-war sentiments among American youth was evidenced by the fact that the Vietnam war became a central issue not only at conferences and conventions of democratic youth and student organizations. The leadership of such pro-governmental organizations as the NSA, under pressure from the rank and file, was unable to avoid this problem. In August 1966, not long before the exposure of the NSA links with the CIA, the Vietnam issue was raised at the NSA congress. According to first-hand reports, the question discussed was not whether or not to condemn the American policy. The question was, rather, how strong that condemnation should be. A number of delegates vehemently denounced the American policy in Vietnam. A radical group at the congress proposed a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Southeast Asia and demanding NSA participation in all effective actions aimed at achieving this aim. This resolution was defeated by a margin of only 30 votes in a committee consisting of 200 delegates. Nevertheless, in spite



of the demagoguery and sidestepping on the part of the NSA leadership and its attempts to place the aggressor and his victim on one plane, the democratically minded delegates to the congress succeeded in having the following points included in the Vietnam resolution: "The war has created a climate in this country which endangers the right of dissent; when dissent is equated with irresponsibility or even disloyalty, basic civil liberties are threatened. The war has drastically affected the American commitment to the resolution of serious internal problems by diverting the nation's resources from vital domestic problems to the war efforts. The war has had a disastrous effect on the educational plans and the lives of young Americans. . . ." The resolution demanded "the immediate cessation of the bombing in North and South Vietnam. The termination of offensive military operations . . . as necessary conditions for a political settlement. The recognition by the United States in an unequivocally clear manner that the National Liberation Front must be a separate party to any negotiations."

The adoption of such a resolution does not mean that the NSA leadership abandoned their pro-imperialist positions. This resolution was a repercussion of the concrete actions by American students to end the war in Vietnam, a reflection of their anti-war sentiments which the NSA leadership was forced to take into consideration lest it lose every vestige of influence with the great mass of the country's students.

American students were among the first to react against new atrocities in Indochina, as was the case in connection with the invasion of Cambodia by American troops, the use of napalm, the bombing of civilian targets in the DRV and the like. Students staged demonstrations, visited homes telling the truth about the war in Vietnam, organized community discussions on the war, published their own newspapers and bulletins, staged sit-ins at railway stations through which trains carrying soldiers destined for Vietnam passed, and, finally, boarded the trains themselves and talked with the soldiers and passed out anti-war literature.

On the whole, students were more active in the struggle for an end to the war in Vietnam than working-class youth, since young workers had to direct their main efforts to finding employment and providing for their livelihood. In

addition, working youth experienced greater handicaps in uniting than the students because of frequent job changes and the obstacles set up by employers and reactionary labor union leaders.

But with the escalation of the war and the growth of the anti-war movement, working youth became increasingly involved in the struggle. For example, working youth and a number of labor unions supported the Anti-War Spring Mobilization of 1967, the first and second Vietnam Moratoriums in October and November 1969, and the spring anti-war demonstrations of 1970, 1971 and 1972.

Anti-war demonstrations organized on a national scale became possible because of the scope of the movement and the growth of the political awareness of its members.

The war in Vietnam demonstrated to the youth-generation the rottenness of imperialism and its aggressive, bloody essence. It was the catalyst for an upsurge of anti-imperialist sentiments among youth. Solidarity with the people of Vietnam helped many young Americans direct their attention to the causes of wars, to social injustice, exploitation, inequality, national and racial oppression, fascism, reaction and militarism. A growing number of young men and women in the United States are beginning to see that these causes lie deep within the capitalist system itself.

The anti-war movement of American youth was growing, it was on the upswing, developing from lower to higher forms of struggle—from passive expression of opposition to active participation in the anti-war movement. This could most clearly be traced in the rise and development of the movements and organizations of American youth known as the New Left.

## THE NEW LEFT AND OTHER GROUPS

In recent years the protest of American youth has been associated with the New Left.\* The term originated from the title of a British magazine *The New Left Review*, which began publication in 1959 after the merger of two university periodicals—*Universities and Left Review* and *The New Reasoner*—both founded in 1957. As were its predecessors, *The New Left Review* was put out by a group of radical postgraduates and young university teachers. The magazine devoted considerable attention to the criticism of capitalism as a factor impeding the spiritual, creative and all-round development of the individual, as well as to problems of the struggle for peace and disarmament. Under its influence, New Left clubs emerged in a number of places; these consisted of student and working-class youth who, for one thing, initiated the Aldermaston Easter marches for peace and nuclear disarmament.

This so-called "English intellectual radicalism" influenced certain circles of students and intellectuals in the United States, who in the late fifties were seeking a way out of the political impasse to which McCarthyism and the Cold War had brought the development of democratic movements in the country.

This was the period when groups whose basic aim was to achieve racial justice emerged once again. The civil rights movement was also joined by pacifists some of whom began to go over from a religious to a political platform.

\* This term has become widely current in the literature. In the present book it is used conditionally, since it falls far short of expressing the essence of the movement it denotes. The term appeared not accidentally, but as an attempt to counterpose youth to the so-called Old Left, with which the leaders of petty-bourgeois "Left" extremist parties and official bourgeois propaganda try to identify primarily the communist and workers' parties and communist youth organizations.

Somewhat earlier, beatniks appeared, who initially expressed their protest against American society exclusively by withdrawing from it and rejecting established moral standards, a posture that found its expression primarily in careless attire, drug-addiction, etc. It would hardly be worth speaking of the beatniks in connection with the New Left if it were not for the fact that many of them soon outgrew their shaggy and unwashed beards and, along with their addiction to hashish and jazz, began to discuss politics, criticize the shortcomings of the system and come out in support of the people of Cuba in the latter's struggle against the attempts of US imperialism to crush their revolution.

The trends mentioned were not of an organized nature and had none of the features characteristic of the contemporary American New Left organizations and movements; in fact, the term, New Left, appeared in the US only much later. But this was the time when in a number of universities (the University of Wisconsin, the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Chicago) the first clubs and organizations of radical students emerged, along with the magazines that reflected their views—*Studies on the Left* and *New University Thought*. These periodicals did not follow any specific political line. In addition to publishing articles on political issues, the problems of preserving peace, and the struggle for civil rights, they also featured discussions on sexual freedom, pornography, etc. This was also the case in the discussions held in the various radical student organizations and clubs. Nevertheless, these organizations may in a certain sense be regarded as the predecessors of the present New Left in the USA. The stagnant years of McCarthyism and the Cold War which had bred the so-called silent generation were followed by a period during which the youth of the country, and above all, its students, gradually became politically oriented.

At first the Establishment attached little importance to the new campus developments, reckoning that they would all end in the familiar petty game of university politics.

But events took an unexpected turn for the Establishment. Within a short span of time, the New Left became an active political force.

What exactly is this so-called American New Left?

There is still no generally accepted criterion of belong-



ing to the New Left. On the whole, the term refers to the organizations and movements, made up mostly of youth, which emerged in the sixties as an expression of protest against the crises in American life. A greater part of these declared that they were independent of the long-existing political parties and groups that had to one extent or another been critical of capitalism.

Such a vague definition has led to a situation where organizations and movements defending the most varied and contradictory political and ideological views are thrown into the category of the New Left.

Proceeding from this definition, however, two main trends in the American New Left can be discerned: a small but extremely noisy Left opportunist and extremist minority and an incomparably greater democratic majority.

#### WHO CAN MAKE MORE NOISE—THE "LEFTISTS" OR THE HIPPIES?

The Left opportunist and extremist trend includes two kinds of organizations. The first are made up of young Americans who are grouped around the pro-Chinese Progressive Labor Party, which itself has about 1,000 members. The second are organizations, such as the Young Socialist Alliance, the Spartacists and the American Committee for the Fourth International, spawned out of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party.

Declarations made by the leaders of the Progressive Labor Party and the youth organizations affiliated with it do not lack revolutionary phrases. They demand immediate revolution—socialism now!—and they brand all those who do not agree with them as traitors of the working class, revisionists and lackeys of the monopolies. They call the police a paper tiger that cannot intimidate the people. But it often happens that in a confrontation with police these Left phrasemongers are the first to turn heel to the "paper tiger". The Progressive Labor Party is becoming further and further isolated from the democratic forces of today's America.

Of the second kind of Left opportunist organizations, the largest is the Young Socialist Alliance with its more than 1,000 members. The Alliance has become notorious in the

New Left for its efforts to cause a split in any democratic movement, including the movement to end the war in Vietnam, and because its members, in spite of their professed adherence to "revolutionary socialism", disappear from demonstrations and picket lines as soon as any concrete action is entailed. Although they say they are against the war, they slander the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, maintaining that the leaders of that country are not real socialists, by which they mean, of course, that they are not real Trotskyists.

In 1960, the alliance expelled a group of members that had taken part in a trip to Cuba prohibited by the State Department. This group formed a small organization called the Spartacists which also specializes in attacking the communist movement, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Like Trotskyist groups of whatever stripe, the Spartacists are thoroughly unscrupulous in their methods.

The influence and scope of the other organizations of a Trotskyist bent may be judged by the fact that, for example, the American Committee for the Fourth International headed by Tim Wohlforth is jokingly called the "Wohlforth family circle".

Bourgeois propaganda goes all out to slur the New Left, to distort its real essence in the eyes of the American public, and to make it look as if the above-mentioned "Leftist" groups are its backbone. This propaganda is intended primarily for the man in the street, whom it tries to convince that the New Left threatens the moral fabric of the American way of life and the security of the average American. For greater effectiveness, such propaganda artificially classifies as being part of the New Left those young Americans whose protest assumes ugly forms and is expressed in drinking, drug-addiction, lawlessness and immoral conduct.

A special place in these bourgeois propaganda efforts is given over to the hippies. Indeed, it is not so difficult to convince the man in the street that they and the New Left are identical. It is often hard to distinguish them by their outer appearance, primarily because of their long hair and careless attire. The average person may not notice the fact that the same long hair is growing out of entirely different heads.

"Hippies live here." These words can often be heard in Georgetown (Washington, D.C.), Old Town (Chicago), Greenwich Village (New York), and many other places. Of course they are not the only ones who live there. Georgetown, for example, is an aristocratic district where many American senators, statesmen, and government officials live. Old Town is mostly inhabited by the so-called American middle class. Greenwich Village has a high concentration of students, since this is one of New York's university centers. But there actually are many hippies in all these areas. Some of them wander about the streets aimlessly, shocking passersby with their outlandish clothing. One wonders at times where they find the ancient hats and jackets they wear and all the beads and trinkets they hang on themselves like the chains worn by the religious ascetics of old. Most of them, however, succeed in lending an antediluvian look to quite modern clothing with the help of simple tools and grandmother's rags. Hippies can spend hours just sitting in cafes. Some of them may be seen asking for hand-outs from passersby. But unlike those whom need forces to beg in the street, they do not ask for a nickel or dime but a whole quarter. Otherwise it would take too long to collect enough for another dose of drugs. These are the hippies proper. But there is another variety—the hippy activists, or the so-called Yippies, who are also uncombed and unwashed, also wear clothing that looks like it has just been taken off a tramp, and also take drugs. They differ from the hippies proper in that they are more active. Frequently that is exactly what they are called—"activists"—while some of them loudly proclaim that they are members of the Youth International Party.

The Yippies publish "underground" newspapers, which, however, are sold quite legally, not at newsstands, though, but by the Yippies themselves on busy streetcorners. It was hard to refrain from buying one of these newspapers, so for twenty-five cents I bought a copy of the *Washington Free Press*. Just that one issue gave a definite idea of the hippies and Yippies. Their ideology, if it can be called such, was clearly outlined in a sort of editorial on meetings. Everything that was written there had at some time and at some place been used before by all kinds of nihilists, abstractionists, and futurists. "Shhhh," the editorial advised. "Listen

at Meeting. Shhhh. Listen to eye movements. Listen to scratching. Listen to your head. Listen to smells. Listen to singing. Listen to touches. Listen to silence. Listen to gestalt vibration. Listen to the writing on the wall." Further, it suggests, "Go naked to meetings. Go high to meetings. . . . Rape ideas not people." And "Don't go forward—There is nothing". But in practice, hippy and Yippy "theorists" engage less in "raping ideas" than in repeating the elements from the writings of Cohn-Bendit and from "Mao's little red book".

Yippies do not just publish newspapers. Many of them took part in protest, particularly against the war in Vietnam. Their protest often assumed very original forms, like painting a yellow star on red and blue US mailboxes to make them look like the flag of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. Once, the inhabitants of Washington got another shock. Near Arlington National Cemetery there is a monument in honor of the American marines. It is a sculpture depicting several marines hoisting the American flag on a faraway island in the Pacific during the Second World War. One morning Washingtonians hurrying to work in their cars noticed that the flag being put up by the sculptured marines was not the American flag, but the flag of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. Rumor has it that the Yippies did that too. But no one can say for sure, because the Yippies have shown an inclination to exaggerate their achievements. For the Yippies, participation in the protest is just a game, an opportunity to show their devil-may-care attitude toward any moral or ethical principles.

It would be wrong to deny that the Yippies stir public opinion. But it is quite another thing to ask what, after all, is there more of here—benefit or harm? Articles in the "underground" Yippy press abound in words and expressions which are not normally used in either the literary or the spoken language of any country. These same words and phrases are also used liberally in the slogans the Yippies cry out at meetings or demonstrations. The Yippies have earned the reputation of being utterly dissolute people as far as their sexual behavior is concerned, to say nothing of their widespread use of drugs.

In practice, by taking part in protest activities, the Yippies



not only tend to sunder the unity of the democratic movement, but also impede the influx into the movement of certain segments of the population who are objectively ready for this but hesitate because they associate all protesting American youth with the Yippies and hippies. There are reasons for this confusion. There is the fact, for example, that many young Americans copy hippy and Yippy fashions, and the fact that the Yippies are extremely vocal and tend to boast loudly about their "achievements". At the same time, no one with any common sense can believe that the hippies and Yippies are capable of effecting any changes in American society, in spite of all the declarations they make.

The Yippies also bring considerable harm to the already existing organizations and movements of the New Left, many of whose members are arrested on suspicion of indecent conduct, keeping drugs, seducing minors, etc., that is, they are accused of the crimes committed by hippies and Yippies. Such actions of law enforcement officers are defended by deliberate propaganda which tries to persuade public opinion that all "disturbers of the peace" are the same, that there is no difference between the New Left and the hippies and Yippies.

Bourgeois propagandists and ideologists purposely lump together under the rubric, "the New Left", all the protest groups of American youth, however ugly their forms of protest may be. They hope thereby to prove that the New Left movement as a whole is made up of immoral, not seriously minded people, i.e., to discredit it in the eyes of the public and thinking young Americans who have not yet entered the democratic movement.

In actual fact the differences between the New Left and the hippies are quite considerable. Not only the hippies but also the Yippies are completely uninterested in the essence of the issues underlying the activity of the New Left organizations. They are far from seeking any real solutions to the crises in modern American society. They only go as far as rejecting some of the superficial features of American reality without proposing anything constructive in their place. Moreover, they do not even bother to search for new personal and social values.

In this the Yippies are little different from the hippies. The latter as a rule come from well-to-do families. Com-

mon for all hippies is that they drop out of school and refuse to work, preferring to live off of charity. An indication of the level of their political consciousness and their involvement with drugs can be derived from the slogan which was popular among them during Lyndon B. Johnson's presidency—"LSD not L.B.J.".

The hippies repudiate the official values of the American way of life and consider themselves pacifists. At the same time, they reject any form of direct action. This is one of the reasons why the hippy movement acquired a mass character at a certain stage, when the majority of American youth were to one extent or another unhappy with the existing state of affairs in the country and their status in society, but not having reached a point where they could understand the causes of the phenomena that negatively affected their lives, they proceeded from the assumption that any effort to achieve even the minimum of reform and change was futile.

In the final count, the hippy protest is directed only against some of the superficial features of bourgeois morality—propriety in relations between the sexes, moderation in drinking, abstinence from drugs, etc.—that is, against standards of social behavior that have long since ceased to prevail, especially within the so-called "middle class" of bourgeois society from which most of the hippies themselves come.

The hippy rebellion is a rebellion on the lowest, most primitive level—a rebellion in the back yard of capitalist society. Even as they rebel against certain surface manifestations of the bourgeois society's stereotypy, the hippies are unable to overcome it themselves. On the contrary, their similarity in dress, appearance, way of life and habits is grotesque reflection of that stereotypy, demonstrating their inability to advance beyond the moral stereotypy of bourgeois society as a whole.

To be sure, after running into experience which gave them insight into the position of the working people, the suppression of freedom by bourgeois society, and the aggressive nature of US imperialism, and finding themselves among people who were waging a real struggle against the causes of the negative aspects of American society, some individual hippies and Yippies join the ranks of the fighters for democ-

racy and become members of the New Left. But most of the hippies and Yippies are unable to budge from the standpoint of a "purely abstract disavowal of the system", as one leader of the civil rights movement put it. Because they come from the prosperous sections of the population and do not question the social and economic foundations of the capitalist society, they have no direct personal experience with exploitation or racial, social and political oppression.

In fact, some bourgeois sociologists even try to take advantage of their nihilism in order to cultivate apolitical attitudes among American youth. As history shows, the bourgeoisie has long learned to manipulate such attitudes skilfully. The hippies are often given flattering attention and even made out to be something like the future of America. For example, Arnold Toynbee maintained in *Life* magazine interview that if hippies "can become positive, productive members of society, going into trades and professions, but with new ideals and a new spirit where money-making does not come first, then I think they may create a new American way of life".

In discussing the hippy movement, bourgeois sociologists attempt to debase the problem of alienation, the scientific analysis of which is finding increasing application in the practice of a number of New Left organizations. The bourgeois sociologists avoid speaking about the alienation of a growing number of Americans from the means of production, the even declining possibilities of their taking any part in their management or in the management of the affairs of society. For the true meaning of alienation, they try to substitute such notions as the "alienation" of a husband, who finds himself out in the street, from his wife, or the "alienation" of the hippies, who have temporarily broken off relations with their parents, from the class or social group they belong to. Others, when they speak of alienation, are really referring to the hostility between people which is a direct result of the competitive spirit and individualism prevailing in capitalist society.

All this appeals to those hippies who, after "alienating" themselves from their wealthy parents for a certain time, ultimately return home to daddy's capital to carry on the business of exploiting the working people of America.

## THE NEW ABOLITIONISTS

Despite their clamorousness, it is neither the hippies nor the Yippies nor the extremists who determine the nature of the New Left.

The nucleus of the New Left in the USA is made up of organizations fighting to preserve democracy, fighting against militarism and the military adventures of American imperialism, against the threat of the ultra-Rightists, and for the freedom and equality of the black population. The 18th National Convention of the Communist Party, USA (June 1966), noted that among the largest and most significant Left Youth organizations were Students for a Democratic Society, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Du Bois Clubs of America and certain sections organized around the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam. In the time that has elapsed since the 18th Convention, some of these organizations have ceased to exist, others have undergone considerable change, but all of them will occupy an honorable place in the history of the postwar democratic youth and student movement in the United States.

An important role in the development of the New Left was played by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), whose militant members were aptly called the new abolitionists by student of the New Left Howard Zinn. The Committee was set up in the spring of 1960 as a result of the campaign of sit-ins to desegregate lunch counters. It received moral and material support from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference headed by Dr. Martin Luther King.

The initial SNCC meeting elected the leadership, passed a resolution to maintain friendly relations with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, adopted the Freedom Now slogan and defined the principle according to which the new organization was to act in a declaration which read in part: "We affirm the philosophical or religious ideal of non-violence as the foundation of our purpose, the presupposition of our faith, and the manner of our action. Non-violence as it grows from Judaic-Christian traditions seeks a social order of justice permeated by love. Integration of human endeavor presents the first step towards such a society..."



In spite of such a doubtful philosophy, the creation of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee marked the beginning of a new period in the fast growing freedom movement. In the words of writer Lerone Bennett Jr., soon after its inception SNCC became "the most radical, the most controversial and perhaps the most creative of all civil rights organizations".

Strictly speaking SNCC never became a real organization in the usual sense of the word. It did not have definite program or a permanent membership. There was only a small central apparatus and groups of permanent militants, the so-called "field secretaries". These were professional civil rights fighters, mostly college graduates or black students who had left their studies to devote themselves full time to SNCC activities.

Yet SNCC soon turned into one of the largest democratic organizations of American youth. By 1966, over 100,000 American students were taking a most active part in enterprises sponsored by SNCC.

SNCC attracted the attention of American youth by its concrete actions. Having launched the movement with the fight for the right of a black citizen to eat a sandwich at any lunch counter, its members soon realized that this was not enough to win equal rights. They saw that most blacks were too poor to eat in white restaurants even if they had the right to do so. This led to the search for new kinds of action. Soon, SNCC was directing its efforts to the struggle for the right of blacks to vote. A broad campaign was launched to register black voters in Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi under the principle "One man—one vote!". Soon after the beginning of this campaign in the Deep South, there were more SNCC militants engaged in voter-registration than members of any other civil rights organization. The voter-registration campaign clearly demonstrated to the militant members of SNCC the political and economic deprivation of the black population.

The SNCC leadership worked out a whole theory of transforming American society on the basis of so-called participatory democracy, under which the white and black poor people would ensure economic, social and political freedom for themselves. According to this conception, individual local communities or residential districts would serve

as the starting point from which eventual nation-wide participatory democracy would develop. In each such district, property would belong to all the residents in common, political decisions would be taken with due consideration given to everyone's opinion, and the rules of communal life would be based on collectivist principles and enforced by the community itself. Thus, a kind of "anti-community" was proposed as the instrument for transforming the entire system of social relations, in other words, the creation, in opposition to the existing local structures and institutions, of parallel microstructures with their own educational system, economic ties, cultural and ethical standards; in the final count, it was the construction of ideal centers of a new order free of the muck of capitalism and capable by their high example of "infecting" the rest of society with the desire for renewal. It is quite clear that, despite all the noble intention of those who formulated this conception, it was saturated through and through with utopian content. Generally speaking, the ideas of the utopian socialists were initially very popular among the SNCC leadership.

One of the manifestations of this in practice was the establishment in Mississippi of an association of poor people to aid in the development of light industry and independent farming. With a little credit the association set up a garment manufacturing and several leather-working shops. SNCC took part in planning a number of cooperatives, a credit association, retail market, etc., in Alabama and Georgia.

In the first two years of its existence SNCC held a strongly negative attitude toward "political action", by which it meant demonstrations, mass protest, and so forth.

SNCC's transition to political activity came as a result of its participation in concrete actions in the struggle for civil rights, such as the 1965 march from Selma to Montgomery, which turned into a march for political freedom.

As it became more politically oriented, SNCC began to reject the methods of struggle which for many years had characterized a number of civil rights organizations and were based on the belief that it was possible to achieve success with the help of the liberal bourgeoisie.

In an effort to prepare the poorest sections of the black population for participation in political activity, SNCC

volunteers travelled to the most remote areas, of the Deep South, where they shared living quarters, food and misfortunes with the people, exhorted them to display dignity and urged them to organize, register and vote. They had not only to tolerate insults and beatings inflicted on them by racists and risk their lives day in and day out, but also to combat the black population's age-old fear of the sheriff, the Ku Klux Klan and the local authorities.

After embarking on direct action in the southern states in 1961, SNCC had to go through many difficulties including a long period of non-recognition by public opinion. SNCC attracted broad public attention only in April 1964, when through its efforts and tireless work the Mississippi Democratic Freedom Party was established as an alternative to the traditional Democratic Party, which completely excluded blacks from political life in that state. In 1965, on the initiative and with the aid of SNCC the Freedom Party challenged the right of five congressmen to hold office, and organized a lobby to have them recalled on the grounds that they were not representatives of the whole population of the state.

SNCC devoted considerable attention to the problem of discrimination and segregation in public schools. In Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee and Arkansas SNCC launched a campaign for the actual desegregation of the school system, for an improvement of instruction and school conditions. It also set up freedom schools, which besides teaching the history of the Negro people often included general education courses lacking in the usual schools for blacks.

In a matter of seven years—between 1960 and 1966—SNCC grew by virtue of its concrete and varied political activity from a small group of 16 former students into the largest civil rights organization in the country, with a permanent staff of militant workers and an annual budget of \$1,000,000. It conducted its activities in 12 states, and enjoyed the support of friends-of-SNCC societies throughout the country, as well as the sympathy and support of tens of thousands of individual young Americans.

SNCC did not restrict its activities to civil rights. The SNCC leaders proceeded from the premise that the source of the shameful features of both domestic and foreign policy

was the existing system in the country. They felt that the events in Selma could not be considered in isolation from the events in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and repeatedly came out strongly against US foreign policy in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

SNCC took an active part in and sponsored many meetings and demonstrations of protest against the US aggression in Vietnam. In the winter and spring of 1967, SNCC mobilized 10,000 of its members to participate in the Vietnam summer campaign, the aim of which was to prevent a split in the bloc of American peace advocates and to use every possible means to bring about a speedy end to the war and the withdrawal of US troops from Vietnam. SNCC members took part in all large anti-war demonstrations, including the massive demonstrations in New York and San Francisco in 1967, the siege of the Pentagon by young Americans against the war in Vietnam at the end of 1967, and all subsequent large anti-war actions.

The movement under consideration was called the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee at the time it was organized. But actually it soon stopped being a purely student organization both in terms of who its members and supporters were and in terms of its objectives.

The SNCC viewpoint on non-violence also changed. American society in itself is a society of violence, a fact which the members of the civil rights movement came up against daily in their activities and which inevitably influenced SNCC to depart from non-violence as the only method of struggle.

Many demonstrations, marches and drives sponsored by SNCC led to sharp clashes with the police and racists, convincing SNCC members in practice that love and morality alone are not enough to put an end to segregation.

In speaking of SNCC's diverse positive activity, it should also be noted that there were extremist tendencies among some of its members. On a number of occasions their approach hampered unity of action with other civil rights organizations. The call for Black Power popular among the black population was sometimes interpreted in a separatist and nationalistic sense with emphasis placed not upon the need for a struggle against the main source of racist oppression—the domination of the monopolies and the capitalist



system itself—but upon the struggle for liberation from the domination of the white man in general. Some SNCC members advocated terror and denied the possibility of cooperation with any sections of the white population in the struggle for the freedom and equality of the black population, regardless of their political convictions. Nationalistic tendencies also affected the relations between the permanent black members and the group of young white activists, who had come into the movement to become leaders of SNCC together with the blacks. The black militants believed that the organization must be “black-led, black-controlled, and black-dominated”, and their leaders ultimately took the position that “whites must consent to let Negroes run their own revolution without being alarmed at the sacrifices and difficulties involved”. Naturally, such a position shocked the white activists and they began to drop out of the movement, thus weakening SNCC and discrediting it to a certain extent in the eyes of democratic white students and youth.

### THE POUNCE OF THE BLACK PANTHERS

In late 1966 and early 1967 there was a noticeable decline in SNCC activity, but this did not mean that there was a decline in the political activity of black youth and students in general. On the contrary, the experience of SNCC showed the need for more definite forms of organization in the New Left's struggle for black freedom and equality. In the place of the former organizationally diffuse movement, former SNCC leaders and activists began to set up black student unions at individual colleges and universities. By the beginning of 1969, such unions had already united in a number of states. The process of their uniting on a national scale began. The unions of black students were closely connected with the fast growing Black Panther Party which itself consisted mostly of youth.

Officially it was founded in 1966 in Oakland, California, by former students Bobby Seale and Huey Newton. But the idea underlying the creation of the new organization had appeared a year earlier and found expression in the activity of the Lowndes County Freedom Organization in Alabama,

set up on the initiative of SNCC leader and active member of the civil rights movement Stokely Carmichael. This idea was to set up self-defense armed groups against racist and police brutality.

Proceeding from the fact that blacks in the United States are constantly persecuted, insulted, and murdered with no protection from the authorities, and basing themselves on the Second Amendment to the US Constitution which guarantees the right of citizens to bear arms, the founders of the Black Panther Party decided to try to put an end to police brutality in the black communities by organizing groups of self-defense. All blacks, they declared, must arm themselves in self-defense against the oppression and brutality of the racist police. Having armed themselves, the Black Panthers did not, however, start shooting at the first policeman they came across, as is maintained in official US propaganda. Actually, they operated as follows. A car with a group of armed black youth would follow a patrol car. Whenever the policemen stopped a black man on the street and began making accusations against him, the Black Panthers would get out of their car and, in the presence of the police, acquaint the victim with his constitutional rights. This proved to be sufficient motive for racists and reactionaries to launch an extensive propaganda campaign with the aim of intimidating the man in the street, presenting the Black Panthers, as well as the other civil rights militants, as rapists, bandits, and killers. Nothing was said about the rules of conduct that had been worked out for the members by the Black Panther Party. According to these rules members were not allowed to use their weapons or even threaten anyone with them except as a last resort. Further, arms were not to be borne while intoxicated, and drugs and excessive drinking were prohibited. Party members were instructed to be courteous, to refrain from frivolous behavior toward women, to inflict no damage to the property of the poor and oppressed, etc. But the Black Panther Party was not set up for self-defense only. From the very start its members sought to alleviate at least in some degree the plight of the ghetto inhabitants. For example, they organized free breakfasts for needy schoolchildren, used the party's meagre funds to set up medical aid centers, and carried on social and educational work.

In contrast to SNCC, the Black Panther Party paid a

good deal of attention from the very beginning to questions of organization and platform.

Nationalistic and separatist trends appeared in the Black Panther Party, especially in the initial period. Some of the members and leaders were against cooperation with other, predominantly white, democratic groups in the country. They maintained that unity between whites and blacks was impossible until the unity of the entire black population was achieved. Unquestionably, such an approach only weakened the growing bloc of democratic forces in America, which, together with other demands of a political nature, posed as one of their main tasks the struggle for the freedom and equality of the black population.

The political platform of the Black Panther Party, adopted in 1966, failed to identify the taproot of the racial problem in the country, namely the dominance of state-monopoly capitalism. Attention was focused instead on putting an end to the plundering of Negro community by the white man. This approach was distorted by official American propaganda to intensify racial prejudice existing in a considerable part of the white population in the USA, and to discredit the civil rights movement and the New Left as a whole.

But the party was not marking time. Its members started to play an active role in the struggle to end the aggression of American imperialism against the Vietnamese people. The party called upon American blacks to refuse to serve in the army of aggression. In the course of this struggle, waged jointly with progressive white youth, the idea that began to take root among Black Panthers was that "we don't hate white people; we hate the oppressor. And if the oppressor happens to be white then we hate him." Efforts were directed within the party to stamp out extremism aimed against the white part of the population. Black Panther leaders began to base their activity on an analysis of the contradictions between capitalism and the interests of the black population and to link the struggle against racism with the need to fight against capitalism, for socialism.

The party leaders now defended the position that whites were not the enemies of the blacks and the blacks were not enemies of whites, but that capitalism was the enemy of both. Addressing the movement from prison, Huey Newton,

a Black Panther leader, said in an interview that "to be a revolutionary nationalist you would by necessity have to be a socialist". The leaders of the party were coming to realize the need for all progressive and democratic forces to unite in the struggle to effect radical social change in the United States. Another point Huey Newton made was that "the revolution in the mother country [the revolutionary struggle of the white population—*author*] will definitely aid us to our freedom and has everything to do with our struggle". Thus, the party set out along the road of cooperating with other revolutionary forces in America. It became a member of a coalition which also included a similar organization of Puerto Rican youth—the Young Lords—and groups of poor young whites from the poorest region in the United States, the Appalachian mountains.

Some of the party's leaders made an attempt to consider the civil rights movement as an integral part of the class struggle. They warned that the Establishment had an interest in the preservation of acute ethnic conflict: it was manipulating racism, trying to represent the struggle of American Negroes as being a racial movement opposed to the class struggle.

If previously, when the organization was primarily an association of self-defense groups set up to protect black communities from police terror, the authorities had tolerated the Black Panthers, now a real "crusade" was proclaimed against them. The call was sounded by J. Edgar Hoover, who called the Black Panther Party the greatest threat to internal security and described it as a hate organization fomenting rebellion and revolution. Persecution and raids against the Black Panthers were carried out throughout the country in an attempt to physically destroy its leaders and rank and file. In April 1968, 17-year-old Bobby Hewton, the party's Minister of Finance, was murdered. Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information, accused of violating freedom of speech, was forced to leave the country. The Minister of Defense, Huey Newton, was sentenced to 15 years in prison on a manslaughter charge. The Secretary-General of the party, Bobby Seale, was accused of conspiracy to murder a police informer and faced the death sentence. But the authorities considered this to be insufficient. On September 12, 1969, he was transported from a San Francisco jail to Chi-



chicago, handcuffed to two other prisoners. Here, he was to be tried for conspiracy to incite riot, on evidence submitted by Robert Pierson, an undercover Chicago policeman who claimed that in one of his speeches in Chicago Bobby Seale had urged his audience to "barbecue some pork", which Pierson interpreted as meaning to "burn some pigs", i.e., policemen.

The courageous stand taken by Bobby Seale at the trial evoked the admiration of progressive America and the hatred of the authorities. Bobby Seale's speeches hit racism and reaction so hard that the judge, in an unprecedented action, ordered him to be handcuffed to his chair and his mouth bound. Physically deprived of the possibility of defending himself, Bobby Seale was sentenced by the Chicago court to four years in prison for contempt of court even before the beginning of the trial on a charge of conspiracy to murder, which was as false as the charge of conspiring to incite a riot.

Other members of the Black Panther Party fell victim to the police even without a mock trial. In the early morning of December 4, 1969, the party secretary in Illinois Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were killed in their beds at home in Chicago.

Four days after the bloody crime in Chicago, 300 policemen surrounded the party headquarters in Los Angeles under the pretext of arresting two of its members who were charged with participating in riots the week before. The eleven members of the Black Panther Party who were in the building put up a courageous resistance for five hours. Five of them were wounded. In addition to these eleven, thirteen other members of the party who had not taken part in the clash with the police were arrested.

The efforts of the authorities to destroy the party by physical violence failed. New fighters replaced those who had been killed or arrested. The party was expanding, its influence in the ghettos and the American democratic movement was growing.

The discarding of nationalism and the recognition of the leading role of class struggle created prerequisites for the transformation of the Black Panther Party into an important component of the anti-monopoly consensus and for the establishment of contacts and cooperation with other revo-

lutionary and democratic organizations. This tendency was manifest in the summer of 1969 when, at the initiative of the Black Panthers, a joint conference was held in Oakland, California, with the participation of dozens of organizations, including the Communist Party and Students for a Democratic Society.

Unfortunately, in spite of the ideological and political progress that was in evidence, the Black Panther Party failed to overcome the essential differences that existed in its ranks concerning the principal motive forces of revolutionary change and tactics of the struggle.

Recognizing the class nature of the civil rights movement, the party, nevertheless, oriented its practical activity mainly towards the poorest sections of the black population and the unemployed who, in the party leadership's view, showed the greatest interest for political organization. Orientation towards the poor and unemployed and defense mostly of their interests inevitably made the party lose sight of the bulk of the black working class. Such a policy hardly contributed to the unity of the civil rights movement with the American working-class movement as a whole and promoted purely extremist tactics—the view that insurrection was the only method of revolutionary struggle. This could not but lead to serious undesirable consequences in the party's activity which were manifest in a heightened interest for the ideas of the utopian socialists, acute conflict and hostility between groups inside the party, and the weakening of unity of action with other parts of the revolutionary and democratic movement.

#### STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Port Huron and Ann Arbor are two towns in the state of Michigan. The former in 1962 and the latter in 1968 were the scene of meetings of the leading bodies of Students for a Democratic Society, an organization of American democratic students. The distance between the towns is not great, neither is the time-span separating one event from the other. But in this period the organization covered a great deal of ground in its development.

The national headquarters of SDS is located in Chicago. Although it is not listed in the telephone book, its address

is well known to many Chicago students. In February 1969 two of them gladly volunteered to take us there.

We arrived at an inconspicuous brick building on Madison Street near Haymarket Square, the site of the demonstration which led to the celebration of May Day as the international workers' solidarity day.

As we came up to a door made out of freshly planed planks, we heard some kind of thumping noises coming from behind it. When we rang, a face appeared in a little opening in the door, and we had to explain who we were and what the aim of our visit was. Such precautionary measures were dictated by the fact that the organization was the object of continual harassment by the authorities and attacks, including physical attacks, by American ultra-Rightists.

When the door opened we had to climb over a pile of sacks containing SDS literature. Almost the entire national leadership proved to be at the top of the stairway which led directly to the exit. They were throwing down sacks with literature and mail. This had become a kind of morning exercise for them. Every day the organization received a huge amount of mail requesting materials, publications, information, etc. The daily outgoing mail of SDS comprised several heavy sacks of literature. The delivery of the mail to the post office was handled by the leaders of the organization themselves. The SDS president at the time, Michael Klonsky, was also there on the stairway, but he was unable to talk to us that day because all the leaders of the organization were leaving for various universities to organize actions of solidarity with the student strike at the University of Chicago.

We met Michael Klonsky two days later in the same building on Madison Street. The desks were full of correspondence. There were many posters on the walls which gave clear-cut picture of SDS activity.

We studied the interior. It was untidy and contained old dilapidated furniture. This was not surprising for the organization had extremely limited means at its disposal. The SDS leaders made great personal sacrifices, refusing any aid from their parents. Like the other SDS staff workers, Michael received \$15 a week, a very small figure, indeed, considering that even the tightest of budgets would require at least \$3 a day for food alone.

SDS members make such sacrifices for a noble cause, but many of them have only an incomplete and vague notion of the ideals involved. Emotions take the place of theoretical analysis; the real situation is not taken into account, nor is the balance of class forces; and some of the members show certain signs of anti-communism, while others adopt a "Leftist" stand and are attracted by ultra-revolutionary slogans. But on the whole, SDS activity is anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist.

The history of SDS has its own characteristic features. It was set up in 1960 by the League for Industrial Democracy, which had been founded in 1905 by Jack London and Upton Sinclair as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

But the league had long ceased to be socialist and degenerated into an organization with an anti-communist ideology. By setting up a student department, that is, the SDS, the leaders of the league hoped to retain their control over the young members of their organization who in the early sixties were showing signs of unrest and beginning to criticize the leadership. But by 1962, it was already apparent that SDS was breaking with the traditional policy of the league's leadership. This manifested itself, in particular, at the Port Huron SDS National Conference which supported revolutionary Cuba, criticized many aspects of American society and American foreign policy, questioned the clause in the organization's charter banning Communists from membership, and advanced the idea that unity of action by all democratic forces was imperative. This was enough to cause the League for Industrial Democracy to withdraw its financial support of SDS. But financial sanctions could not stop the development of the organization along the road of struggle for democracy.

The conference adopted what came to be known as the Port Huron Statement. It was a document of a rather limited nature, expressing no clear platform or ideology, nor defining the political strategy of the organization.

While it criticized pathological anti-communism, it also contained certain propositions directed against the communist movement and the socialist countries. The statement was intended for intellectuals, the middle strata and students, whom its authors regarded as the main force for effecting social changes. The emphasis, however, was not on an anal-



ysis of the contradictions of capitalism, nor on irreconcilable class antagonisms, but on humanistic aspects.

The statement laid particular stress on the idea that the individual must take part in solving the problems which determine the nature and direction of social development, and that society should be "organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation" in social affairs. The ideal social system was seen as "a democracy of individual participation" (participatory democracy) which would embrace all aspects of economic, political and social life. Such a democracy, in the view of the authors of the statement, should replace the decaying democracy of contemporary American society, thus leading to a radical change in society or, as the SDS was wont to put it, to the downfall of the system of corporate liberalism. The SDS documents did not elaborate on what would replace the existing system in the USA.

Such a notion of the aims of the movement indicated that, at that time, the members of the organization were more concerned with the search for new individual values than with the task of working out a clear program, ideology and political strategy. There were strong avant-gardist tendencies among the SDS members; they were too sure of themselves as the only organization through which radical changes could be effected in the USA. Characteristic of many of them were: idealism; too great an emphasis on moral values to the detriment of ideology; nihilism; rejection of authority and blanket criticism of the bureaucracy allegedly inherent in all the "old" parties without exception.

Fired by the idea of participatory democracy, SDS members began work in the ghettos and other poverty-stricken areas of a number of large industrial centers of the USA. Their aim was to transform the poorest part of the population in the country into an active political force by encouraging all the inhabitants of each such community to take an active part in solving all the political, social and economic problems that affected them. Their idea of participatory democracy involved the creation of something like popular assemblies, the introduction of which would begin in individual districts and cities.

In 1963, SDS members were already organizing "community projects" in 12 cities where students lived and

worked in slum areas for a year or more in an effort to demonstrate what they meant by participatory democracy and to put it into practice. Their work involved organizing blacks in the Northern cities and creating a basis for the progressive movement among the poor sections of the white population, but it often assumed a philanthropic character and amounted to applying pressure on local authorities to improve living and social conditions in the poor areas. Nonetheless, under US conditions, even this kind of activity has political implications.

Though utopian in nature, the endeavor contributed to a better understanding of the life of the working people and their day-to-day problems. It prompted a reappraisal of many initial assumptions and notions and tended to broaden the range of the organization's activity. As a result, there developed a sharper awareness that an effective struggle to transform contemporary American society required the unity of all democratic forces.

SDS members became actively involved in the civil rights movement. For a number of years, the organization cooperated closely with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and took part in all of its major undertakings.

But SDS gained particular popularity and prestige among American students through its anti-war activity, through its struggle to put an end to the war in Vietnam which most SDS members from the very beginning regarded as a product of the system existing in the USA and as part of a policy of suppressing revolutionary movements throughout the world under the banner of anti-communism. SDS sponsored the first mass protest against the war in Vietnam. Its initiative was supported by all Left organizations and many independent groups throughout the country working for peace. The result was a march on Washington on April 17, 1965, in which 25,000 persons took part. This march introduced a new element into the anti-war movement known as the rejection of the policy of exclusion. Communists openly participated in the march with the consent of the other groups. This was an important turn of events, for the policy of exclusion had hampered the peace movement for many years.

The departure from anti-communism led to a complete

break with the League for Industrial Democracy, whose leaders had adopted a special resolution in June 1965, saying that they were "deeply troubled" that the SDS had "removed from its constitution and membership card the long-standing reference to communism as an authoritarian movement", and demanding that SDS should return to the bosom of "true democracy".

The SDS leadership ignored this demand. Disengagement from the league's tutelage facilitated the further development and strengthening of SDS. Evidence of this could be seen at the SDS National Conference which took place in Clearlake, Iowa, in August-September 1966, and was attended by 550 delegates who came from virtually every state in the union.

The conference discussed a wide range of political issues such as election campaign politics, the Black Power slogan, and joint activity with the Communists. There were also discussions on the workers' movement, the working class, the anti-war movement, the draft, American imperialism, racism in the USA and South Africa, and the art of organizing youth groups.

SDS members who were Communists or persons whose views were close to Marxism actively participated in the discussions. Their speeches were listened to with great interest.

A large part of the work at the conference was devoted to the search for "radical alternatives" for solving the crises in American society.

A positive tendency that manifested itself in the course of the discussions was toward a growing understanding of the role of Big Business in all aspects of American life, and the desire to make a scientific analysis of the system of state-monopoly capitalism, although the participants did everything they could to avoid using this term.

Great interest was evoked by the debate, which went on for several hours, on joint activity with the Communists. The question debated was not whether or not to exclude Communists from the organization, as was the case at previous conferences. Attention was focused, rather, on such questions as whether the Communists who were members of SDS be required to make their membership in the Communist Party public; what was the attitude of the Communists

to SDS; and what were the reasons for their desire to become members of SDS.

The problem of the war in Vietnam affected the entire work of the conference even though its central role was denied. All the delegates were unanimous in their determination to struggle to put an end to the war, but the prevailing opinion at the conference was that the war could not be stopped before radical changes were effected in the United States, and that therefore the struggle against the war was to a large extent futile.

Some other weak points of the organization also manifested themselves in the work of the conference. For example, although some of the participants spoke of the urgent need to work out a clear ideological platform and draw up a set of organizational principles, nothing was achieved along the lines due to lack of unity among the conference delegates.

The conference also revealed the narrowness of the SDS's social base clearly showing that the organization conducted its activities primarily among two youth groups—on university campuses and among poor whites. There was only an insignificant number of black youth among the delegates, and no Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans at all.

The conference adopted no decisions on organizational matters, did nothing to strengthen the national leadership, and failed to concretize its program. All this unquestionably had a negative effect on the organization's subsequent activity. But many of these shortcomings were overcome in the ensuing struggle.

For example, by the end of 1966, there was essentially no place in the SDS for anyone who expressed doubt as to the need for a maximum buildup of the anti-war movement demanding an immediate end to the aggression of American imperialism in Indochina.

Soon after the conference in Clearlake, SDS reaffirmed at a meeting of its national council in Berkeley its determined opposition to the immoral, illegal war of extermination being waged by the US government against the people of Vietnam. It was resolved to make every effort to organize resistance to the US foreign policy within the armed forces, and with this aim to begin publishing newspapers and other literature for American servicemen.



The struggle for peace in Vietnam became an integral part of all the campus "unrest" and "disorder" which in the first six months of 1969 spread to over 200 colleges and universities, and to 300 in April 1970.

Anti-war protest was now regarded by the SDS leadership as a part of the struggle against the system of exploitation and oppression of peoples existing in the USA, a system which, as former SDS president Michael Klonsky told us in our conversation with him, in its pursuit of profit and strategic resources seeks to establish American "corporate capitalism" in the whole world. This system, Michael continued, is quite correctly called imperialism, and we support any struggle aimed against the advance of imperialism.

SDS continues to regard its giving vigorous support to the fight against racism, for the freedom and equality of the black population as one of its tasks in the struggle against the reactionary domestic policies of American imperialism. In Klonsky's view, this can most effectively be done by involving the exploited part of the white population in the struggle for the radical transformation of the existing system.

The concrete actions organized by SDS combine different political tasks. For example, in the spring of 1968, during the events at Columbia University thousands of students constructed barricades and fought bravely with the police for several days. This action, as we know, culminated a four-week strike in which students were protesting against (a) the university's involvement in military research for the government and corporations and (b) the racist policies pursued at the university. The students were fighting against the intention of the Establishment to use them and their knowledge to support exploitation, social and racial oppression and the military-industrial complex. SDS believes, Klonsky went on, that without this kind of struggle students will not only be unable to effect radical structural changes in society but will not even achieve any significant changes in the system of higher education or the democratization of university life. Moreover, there is a growing awareness within the ranks of the organization that in order to wage a successful struggle against university administrations they have to look for aid and support among the working sections of the population and primarily among the working class.

SDS strives to help radical workers in their struggle against capitalists and reactionary labor union leadership. SDS members, Klonsky told us, are not only concerned with higher wages and better working conditions for their brothers and sisters who work in factories, but with the transformation of working-class action into a movement directed against the whole capitalist system. These are the problems that are in the center of the attention of members of the organization. They are widely discussed and various opinions are expressed, but the very raising of these problems, Klonsky summed up, is indicative of the transition being made by an increasingly significant part of the students who support SDS from individual protest, based on emotions and dissatisfaction with one or another aspect of American reality, to social protest which questions the very foundations of the existing order in the country.

In the summer of 1968, a group of SDS members conducted a work-in campaign in which students would work for several months in factories as common laborers. During these months, they found out the viewpoint of workers on the Vietnamese problem, enlisted worker support for the demand to immediately withdraw troops from Vietnam, explained the meaning of racism, and discussed the radical student movement and its aims and other political issues. But the main aim of the campaign was to listen to what workers themselves had to say and to learn from their life experience. Taking part in the work-in, the students had an opportunity to see for themselves and to show the workers that they had common enemies in the exploiting upper crust (or, as one driver said after a conversation with students, "the people that run your schools are the people we work for—we have the same enemies"), and therefore many common aims for joint struggle.

The 1968 student work-in seriously troubled the authorities. Industrial enterprises were warned of an impending "student invasion". They were advised to be careful in hiring students and by all means to demand to see their draft cards and check with police files. Reactionary labor union leaders also took steps to keep students out of industrial enterprises. They warned workers that a student influx would hurt production, called upon them to chase the reds from the factories and to show those college kids that "workers

today are members of the middle class, not the 'proletariat' waiting to join a revolution".

But the students persevered. Concealing the fact that they were college students, they got past the barriers and succeeded in demonstrating their sincere desire for genuine solidarity with the working class. In spite of the obstacles placed in their way by employers and labor union leaders, they won the confidence of workers, as evidenced by the fact that SDS gained new members from among working-class youth. Direct and personal contact with the working class helped to further reduce student avant-gardist attitudes among SDS members. Beginning with 1966, the question of SDS's relation to the working class was debated at virtually every meeting of its governing bodies. It was only at the National Council meeting in December 1968, however, that the important resolution was passed orienting the organization toward the working class as the leading force in the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society. The resolution noted that the students "have to reach out to new constituencies" in order to create a revolutionary youth movement, and declared that student struggles "must be integrated into the struggles of the working people".

The resolution emphasized the need for a Marxist-Leninist class analysis of society and for creating a broad anti-racist, anti-imperialist, class-conscious movement which should enter into an alliance with the working class. These ideas were confirmed and further developed at the SDS National Convention in Chicago in June 1969. In a statement of the SDS National Office which was passed at the convention, SDS members declared "themselves a socialist movement", standing for "the public ownership of the means of producing wealth"; they gave "full support to the national liberation struggles of the oppressed people against US imperialism", including armed struggle; and they "absolutely rejected" all forms of anti-communism. The Maoist Progressive Labor faction was expelled from the organization. The convention clearly showed that the initial humanitarian-moral consciousness which many progressive American students displayed at the time of the founding of SDS had developed into a strong political conviction and commitment to the interests of the working people.

As SDS developed organizationally and politically its

membership also grew. While in the autumn of 1964 it had only 900 members, in 1969 it had 300 branches and a membership of almost 100,000. SDS became the country's largest radical student organization and a major component of the New Left in the USA.

SDS has long been the object of attacks and repression by the authorities and reactionaries. The problem of the "radicalization" of students has been and still is in the center of attention of the FBI and judicial and law enforcement agencies. The SDS question has come up frequently in Congress, where demands have been made to outlaw the organization. SDS members have been persecuted by the police, and many attempts have been made to split their ranks. Such efforts were intensified after the SDS Chicago convention in 1969, when the FBI, bourgeois liberals, ultra-Rightists and ultra-Leftists, anarchists, Trotskyists and others all closed ranks against the SDS.

The methods used by the authorities against radical students are only too well known; they involve police clubs, tear gas, bullets, handcuffs and prison. The bourgeois liberals have a more sophisticated approach. They try to infiltrate the Left radical student movement in order to undermine it from within, are not averse to embracing some of the movement's more general slogans and even take part in anti-war demonstrations. What the bourgeois liberals perceive as the main threat to capitalism is the elaboration by the movement of a long-range program and clearly formulated aims. That is why they do everything possible to impede unity of action and to keep the movement in an amorphous state. For under such conditions it is much easier for them to preach "class harmony" and "racial cooperation", and to try to replace militant action to end the war in Vietnam with "non-violent protest". And the bourgeois liberals flavor this kind of activity with their favorite seasoning—anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Not far behind them, albeit in their own way, are the ultra-Left phrase-mongers of every hue and shade, above all the Maoists and Trotskyists. They try to implant in the minds of SDS members the idea that the Communist Party does not understand the real needs and interests of radical students and is incapable of leading them toward the goal of "overthrowing capitalism", that the Soviet Union "is in col-



lusion with US imperialism" and "hinders the development of the revolutionary and national liberation movement of the peoples". Such propaganda has a definite effect upon some members of SDS who have failed to overcome completely the influence of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. There is talk of the Soviet Union's alleged inconsistency in supporting the Vietnamese people in their struggle against American imperialism, of its support of dictatorships in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and so forth. One SDS leader quite seriously told us about how, at the Sofia youth festival, the Soviet delegation had tried to outshout New Left students who were chanting the words "Ho Chi Minh". This leader was not at the festival himself, but someone had told him about it. He was also told, incidentally, that Soviet students "do not study Marxism, are apolitical and do not demand the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam". The noxious and mind-eroding fog emitted by the anti-communist propaganda machine is designed to disunite the various organizations and groups struggling for democracy and social progress and against imperialism and capitalism. But that fog steadily dissipates as the democratic movement develops, as the political awareness of its members grows, and as they become better acquainted with the Marxist-Leninist theory and various aspects of the foreign and domestic policy of the USSR and other socialist countries.

But it is still far from having dissipated completely. The combined efforts of the authorities, bourgeois liberals and opportunists succeeded in sowing discord in the ranks of SDS. A contributing factor was that most of the members in the organization came from the petty bourgeoisie and were not ready to wage a consistent struggle against capitalism. Various factions emerged. An ultra-Leftist faction known as the "Weathermen" stepped up its activities, bringing out the old moth-eaten calls for immediate armed revolt against imperialism and screaming about the "degeneration of the working class". At the same time, these sorry revolutionaries following the "the worse—the better" maxim, declared that if the fascists were to come to power in the USA they would live under fascism.

A clearer expression of the true meaning of contemporary arch-revolutionism is yet to be heard!

Admittedly, disunity has lessened the force of the actions initiated by SDS. However, it has shown a growing maturity on the part of a significant number of members who reject ideological omnivorousness and firmly adhere to the positions of class struggle, the positions of Marxism-Leninism and scientific socialism, seeing in them the only realistic way toward the revolutionary transformation of society.

#### DU BOIS—SYMBOL OF STRUGGLE

The organization known as the Du Bois Clubs of America originated from a small Marxist club founded by students in San Francisco in the summer of 1963. The club's success in its first year gave rise to the idea of setting up similar clubs throughout the country, to be called the Du Bois Clubs. The Du Bois Clubs of America took shape as a national organization at a San Francisco convention in June 1964. Unemployment, education, the civil rights struggle, the peace movement, participation in election campaigns, and the fight against the ultra-Rightists—these and other issues of concern to young Americans were discussed in detail at the convention's plenary and committee meetings. According to a pre-convention document drawn up by its sponsors, the convention was called by "a group of young people who felt that socialist alternatives must be explored if this country is to solve pressing political, social and economic problems".

It was not by chance that the name of the outstanding Negro writer and sociologist William Edward Burghardt Du Bois was chosen for the organization. His life and work are symbolic of the tendencies in political and social development characteristic of a definite part of today's American youth-generation. Having started his activity with petty-bourgeois movements (Du Bois was one of the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1909, and an organizer of the First Pan-African Congress, which took place in 1919 in France) and with idealistic plans for achieving equality through the education of the Negro population, Du Bois eventually came to the conclusion that American Negroes could gain genuine freedom and equality only through the struggle for unity within their own ranks, and through the struggle for socialism and

peace in the world. To this struggle he devoted a considerable part of his life. Toward the end of his life he joined the USA Communist Party.

The Du Bois Clubs sought to consider the problems facing American youth not in isolation from each other, an approach to a certain degree characteristic of the other New Left organizations, but in their totality. Proceeding from a Marxist analysis of American society, they perceived the close connection between American imperialism's aggressive policy, on the one hand, and racial discrimination, unemployment among youth and other problems, on the other. And they did not fail to take this into account in their practical activity and when setting up new sections of the organization. This is borne out, in particular, by the fact that the Club's membership includes representatives of various ethnic groups.

In August 1966, the Du Bois Clubs sponsored national action to end the war in Vietnam and to "begin a REAL war on poverty in America". Throughout its existence, the organization's position was one of unequivocal condemnation of the aggression in Vietnam, and it resolutely demanded an immediate end to the war. Its members took an active part in anti-war demonstrations and organized teach-ins both on college campuses and in the community, at which they tried to show the close connection between the Vietnam war and unresolved domestic social problems. In a number of cities, the Du Bois Clubs organized youth protests and demonstrations demanding jobs, decent wages and better housing.

The organization carried on work directly among working youth—white and black—and paid great attention to developing relations with the working class, be it in the form of such community projects as children's day-care centers, or in the form of conducting meetings devoted to problems of interest to workers, May Day rallies, demonstrations, etc.

This kind of activity, coupled with the organization's open declarations of its adherence to socialist ideas, could not but disturb the reactionary forces and official America.

As early as 1965, J. Edgar Hoover stated the following in his annual report:

"During 1965, the Communist Party's year old youth front, the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs of America consolidated its

resources and became more ambitious in its efforts to expand its influence among the youth of the Nation. Volunteer recruits, who were trained at a Communist Party cadre training school, were sent into the Midwest area during the summer of 1965 to bolster the midwest region of the Du Bois Clubs.

"Two Du Bois Clubs' leaders recently openly announced their affiliation with the Communist Party and the Du Bois Clubs national president has issued a public statement that the organization welcomes Communists as members."

Attacks against the Clubs were stepped up in the spring of 1966. On March 6, the building housing the organization's National Committee in San Francisco was shaken by an explosion, while two days earlier, on March 4, Attorney General Katzenbach had demanded that the Du Bois Clubs register as a "Communist-front" organization in accordance with the McCarran Act. This action was undertaken with the aim of destroying the Clubs. Even Katzenbach implied as much when he said in an interview that the result of the McCarran Act being enforced in the past was that it almost always meant the end of the organization under investigation. The Attorney General's onslaught against the Clubs was backed up by congressmen who lashed out against those universities that had allowed the organization's local chapters to be officially registered on campus as student clubs. For example, US congressman Ashbrook assailed the University of Wisconsin administration for its "acceptance of the Du Bois Clubs as a perfectly proper (small 'D') democratic type of organization". In fact, the only "evidence" Ashbrook could produce in support of the thesis that the Clubs were undemocratic was a reference to Gus Hall's words that the Communist Party and the Du Bois Clubs "have the closest ties since they occupy a Marxist position", and that "many of the members of the Du Bois Clubs have joined the Communist Party". The real reason for the attacks against the organization, however, was not its alleged undemocratic nature, but, as stated in congressional subcommittee hearings, the fact that it "hopes to win recognition and support from both domestic and international civil rights proponents, African nationalists and more particularly the Negro youth of the United States. . . . The new Marxist youth organization



is designed to attract youth interested in peace, disarmament, civil rights, and the like".

The Du Bois Clubs stood up to the attacks of the ultra-Rightists, the FBI, Katzenbach, and the congressmen. They came out with a statement exposing the reactionary, anti-democratic and unconstitutional nature of the McCarran Act which "contains a definition of Communism... in its content and much of its language... identical with the characterization of Communism offered by Adolph Hitler".

Registering in accordance with the McCarran Act meant that every member of the organization would have to affix his signature to a document stating that he was part of "a Communist front organization... a criminal conspiracy... seeking the forcible overthrow of the United States government by any and all means, including espionage, sabotage, and deceit". In that event, no member would be allowed to take part in public activities or work in defense industries or in the labor unions, or receive a passport for travel abroad, and the organization as a whole would be cut off from all sources of financial support. This would amount to nothing other than the disbandment of the organization. The Du Bois Clubs began the fight for their right to exist.

The investigation of the Du Bois Clubs undertaken by the Attorney General prompted the organization to launch a campaign against the McCarran Act. Other democratic organizations gave their support. The *Young Communist* magazine wrote that "every organization in the peace movement has condemned the action of Attorney General Katzenbach. The major figures and organizations in the civil rights movement have come to the support of the Du Bois Clubs". The actions aimed at splitting the unity of the anti-war forces in America produced the opposite effect. The attempt of the government to revive the McCarthyist "red threat" myth was a failure. A year after the beginning of the investigation, the Du Bois Clubs had grown in membership, without, of course, sacrificing any of their principles. On the contrary, at the National Convention of the Du Bois Clubs held in Chicago in June 1966, these principles were further developed. The preamble to the constitution adopted at the convention read:

"...We join together to fight against the evils which plague our generation and our world—poverty, racism, ex-

ploitation and war. We will build a movement which can create a new America—a society where economic and social justice for all men will prevail, where every individual may develop to the limits of his capability, where human dignity is valued above corporate profit; a world where men shall not know want, where there will be no war."

At the beginning of their activity, the Du Bois Clubs consisted mostly of student youth. But from its very inception, the organization set itself the task of involving working youth in active politics. There was a definite measure of success in this endeavor. In February 1969, a National Conference of Young Workers of America was convened in Chicago at the initiative of the Du Bois Clubs; it was attended by 72 young workers from 14 branches of industry, including the automobile and steel industry. That year, the organization had chapters in factories and plants in 15 states. In response to the call of the Du Bois Clubs, working youth in New York, San Francisco, Chicago and Boston came out for May Day demonstrations in 1969. The activists of the organization set up Marxist circles for working youth, in which the works of Lenin and other Marxist classics were studied. In this way they were making their contribution to the creation in the USA of a Marxist organization of young workers.

The young people who joined the organization were genuine patriots of America, prepared to wage the difficult and hazardous struggle that required willpower, courage and self-sacrifice. In Chicago, I had the opportunity of meeting some of the rank-and-file members of the Du Bois Clubs. Here is a brief sketch of a few of them.

Jim was a black youth who had made an early start in the struggle for democracy. He took an active part in the work of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, participating in many sit-ins, marches, Freedom Rides and clashes with the police. He was in the black voter registration campaign in the Deep South. On three occasions he was shot at. But Jim's will was not broken by bullets, police threats or the actions of American reactionaries. He continued the struggle. He joined the Du Bois Clubs, he said, because the organization based its activities on Marxist-Leninist theory and the ideas of socialism. He was convinced that the problems plaguing America could be solved only through the

struggle for democracy and socialism, only by following the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism.

Roger Kapthammer was a white student in the philosophy department of the University of Illinois. He was not over 20, but already an experienced activist, having gone through the fire of many undertakings and being subjected to repeated arrests. The last time he had been arrested was in August 1968 in Chicago, during the Democratic National Convention. The police attacked a group of students that Roger was in. This time, the police were not only wielding clubs, but also carrying containers resembling cans of hair-spray. But actually they held gas. The police sprayed the gas right into the faces of the demonstrators, causing the latter to choke and gasp for breath, unable to move or to speak. In this condition the students, including Roger, were thrown into police vans. After they recovered and started to protest, the police, in order to silence them, repeated the experiment with the gas.

Other fighters for democracy, who took part in the demonstrations in Chicago at that time, also spoke from personal experience of the brutal methods used by the police. It was not against the hippies, but primarily against members of the Du Bois Clubs, SDS, and other democratic youth organizations that the clubs, the gas and even firearms were used.

Threats and beatings come not only from police in uniform. They may come also from people in ordinary civilian clothing, or even from someone wearing a white doctor's gown. Ted Pearson, a member of the Du Bois Clubs, was the victim of an automobile crash. He had not fully recovered from a serious operation he had undergone when the attending physician told him that had he known during the operation that Pearson was a member of the Communist Party, he would have done what he could to make the operation a failure. Even the humane medical profession is not free of the ultras against whom progressive American youth also has to wage a courageous struggle.

Ted himself told me about this incident as we were on the way from Chicago to Gary to attend a concert being given at Indiana University by Pete Seeger, the famous singer of folk songs and songs of protest.

Although Chicago is in Illinois and Gary in Indiana, I

saw no great expanse of Midwest prairie along the road between the two cities. It is only an hour's drive and it is impossible to determine where Chicago ends and Gary begins. The whole extent of the ultramodern highway is lined with industrial enterprises.

I could not help asking Ted to make a short stop at a place which has gone down in the history of the class battles of the American working class. The old red brick factory buildings, the old square, the same old cafe where the workers gather as they come off their shift—all this brought me back to the time of the famous Pullman strikes during which the blood of working America had flown. I was deeply moved by the fact that I was standing at the site of former class struggles with a young man who, together with his comrades, was carrying on the glorious traditions of the American working movement.

#### A NEW YOUTH ORGANIZATION

In the morning of February 7, 1970, the entrance, lobby and banquet room on the ground floor of a hotel in Chicago were unusually crowded. A large number of young people were standing around conversing with each other on various subjects, and just as many FBI agents were brazenly photographing the young men and women. Tables were set up in the banquet room, carrying little placards with the names of twenty-one states. Soon, the young men and women took their places at the tables, the room became quiet, and the chairman declared open the constituent congress of a Marxist-Leninist organization of American youth, called the Young Workers Liberation League. In the year of Lenin's centenary the new organization took up the fine traditions of the American Young Communist League,\* which for 22 years had been in the vanguard of the struggle of American youth for their rights, for Negro equality, and for friendship with the USSR, and which had sent hundreds of its members

\* The American Young Communist League was founded in 1922 and numbered about 30,000 members. In 1944, when the US Communist Party was dominated by Right opportunism, i.e., so-called Browderism, the Young Communist League was disbanded for no reason whatever.



to the international brigades to defend Republican Spain and later to fight against Japanese militarism and German Nazism.

It was fitting that the constituent congress of this Marxist-Leninist youth organization was held in Chicago, for that city has long been the center of the progressive workers' movement in the USA. As mentioned earlier, it was the site of the first May Day demonstration in the world. The Communist Party, USA, was founded there on September 1, 1919. In the thirties, the largest strikes in the history of the country were held in Chicago, and in 1968, during the Democratic National Convention, the city was the scene of massive anti-war demonstrations and clashes with the police. Repercussions of the latter events were still being heard at the time of the constituent congress. They emanated from a Chicago courtroom, where seven young participants in the 1968 demonstrations were standing trial—a trial which the American progressive press described as the most shameless farce in the history of American justice.

The initiative in creating the Young Workers Liberation League was taken by two organizations that in recent years have been extremely active in the progressive American youth movement—the youth section of the Communist Party and the Du Bois Clubs of America. They were joined by youth from the Black Panther Party, groups of progressive Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth, former SDS members and certain independent groups with a socialist orientation.

The organization was set up because conditions had become favorable for the extensive introduction of Marxist-Leninist ideology among youth and for participation of young men and women in all the progressive movements in America, above all the anti-war movement, the movement for racial equality and the movement to defend the interests of young workers. This was the explanation given by Jarvis Tyner, chairman of the Temporary Organizing Committee and former national president of the Du Bois Clubs of America. In his twenty seven years, Tyner had traversed a long and difficult road of struggle. At first he was a lithographer and furniture maker, then became one of the youngest shop stewards in the militant teamsters union, carrying on work among black workers in Philadelphia and New York. Begin-

ning with 1967, he was president of the Du Bois Clubs for three years.

Other fearless representatives of American youth were present at the congress. Here are some of them. Twenty-year-old Barry Cohen, a student at the University of Michigan and former SDS member. He organized and led the joint strike of students and tenants in Ann Arbor, was a leader of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and took part in the March Against Death in Washington on November 15, 1969. Twenty-four-year-old Puerto Rican Roque Ristorucci had to leave school to earn a living. At a very young age, he joined the struggle for the freedom of Puerto Ricans and Negroes and became active in the peace movement. He was one of the leaders of the Du Bois Clubs, having come into that organization after a short time with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a conciliatory organization.

Twenty-three-year-old Carolyn Black, a black, had led the struggle for black enrolment in college preparatory courses while still in high school. In 1963, she was arrested for taking part in a sit-in at a Woolworth's lunch counter. In 1965-66, she was in the South as a permanent worker in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by Martin Luther King. In 1967, she became one of the leaders of the Du Bois Clubs. In 1969, while engaged in preparations for the constituent congress of the Marxist-Leninist youth organization, she was again arrested, this time in St. Petersburg, on charges of inciting a riot that had taken place on the eve of her arrival there.

Judy Edelman, a twenty-eight-year-old graduate of Stanford University, carried on extensive work in the South as a member of SNCC between 1963 and 1966. Then she became a leader of the United Electrical Workers in New York. In November 1969, she organized the participation of 2,000 union members in the Washington March Against Death. She was arrested several times and spent time in jail for participating in civil rights and labor union struggles.

I have told about only five of the three hundred persons at the constituent congress, each of whom had experienced the difficult struggle for peace, freedom and equality and had gone through clashes with police, beatings and arrests.

The congress directed its attention mainly to problems of working-class youth (representatives of which made up over half of the delegates), the question of their participation in the anti-war movement and in the struggle against reaction and fascism, and to questions of proletarian internationalism. A clear demonstration of the delegates' internationalism was the enthusiasm with which they welcomed the greetings from Young Communist Leagues of a number of countries. And when the congress was presented with a Red Banner from the Soviet Young Communist League, all the delegates rose, and through the corridors of that fashionable American hotel echoed their solemn singing of the *Internationale*.

The constitution adopted at the congress defined the aim of the organization as the struggle for socialism, noting that "the only system that can provide an alternative to this brutal exploitation and oppression is socialism, a system based on working class state power and the social ownership of the means of production". The preamble to the constitution also stated that the Young Workers Liberation League "fights for the unity of all youth against racism, militarism, poverty, the growing danger of fascism and all other forms of monopoly oppression. In this united front of youth this organization stresses the necessity to fight for the leading role of the working class, black, brown and white, its revolutionary organization and for its ideology of Marxism-Leninism".

The congress delegates displayed great political maturity when they scotched an effort made by a group of Leftists to push through a resolution "On the Right to Self-Defense", which called for the use of arms in clashes with the police and army during demonstrations and picketing. Clearly, the organization would have directly been outlawed and destroyed had such a resolution been passed.

The reactionary bourgeois press kept silent about the congress, as if it knew nothing about it. But although the press was silent, the forces of reaction themselves were operating. There were not only FBI agents in the hotel. On the very first day of the congress a group of fascist-type hecklers crashed the congress, but was thrown out by the delegates. On the next day, another such group tried to force its way in, but it too was repulsed. As is always the case, taking a position on the same side of the barricades as the reaction-

aries were the Trotskyists. Members of the Young Socialist Alliance were constantly at the entrance and in the lobby of the hotel passing out leaflets denouncing the congress and calling for its dissolution. The Alliance even composed an "open letter" to the members of the new organization. The letter, supersaturated with anti-communist and anti-Soviet slander, ended with an appeal not to set up another Marxist-Leninist youth organization because one such organization (the Young Socialist Alliance) already existed. The delegates responded by tearing up their copies of the "open letter".

The founding of the Young Workers Liberation League marked the beginning of a new stage in the development of the modern revolutionary movement of American youth.



## CLASH OF IDEAS AND IDEOLOGIES

The wide range of democratic demands put forward by the New Left in the USA indicates that it has reached out beyond university walls, has involved considerable sections of the young working people, in particular Negroes, and has become an important component of the general democratic movement. Its opposition to the monopolies and to capitalism has hardened in the course of concrete action. New forces are joining the Left radical youth and student movement. As it acquires a mass following, organizational issues and the working out of ideological and political principles become more urgent. Every year the Left radical youth and student movement comes to play a more significant part in the movements of political protest sweeping through the country.

The members of the New Left are noted for their militant spirit which is reflected in almost all their actions, even if they are "non-violent". The entire youth movement in the United States owes much to this spirit for the success in dispelling the fear of McCarthyism, and turning the silent generation into an active force, vocal in expressing its opposition to many aspects of the domestic and foreign policy of the Establishment.

### FALSE FRIENDS OF YOUTH

At the same time the Left radical youth and student movement in the USA is searching for new values to replace the American way of life it rejects. There are many unsolved problems of a political, organizational and particularly ideological nature facing the members of the movement.

This is due to the diverse, and predominantly petty-bourgeois social makeup of the New Left student organizations and groups. Most young Americans lack theoretical training and experience in the class struggle. A majority are not even

familiar with the history of the revolutionary and democratic movements of the American working people. Their motives for taking part in the struggle are purely personal. The members of the New Left organizations find themselves very much on their own due to the absence of a clear political platform and of a strong organization.

Some of them were bent on a continuous struggle for an end to the war in Vietnam but attached no importance to the civil rights movement. Others concentrated their efforts exclusively on the civil rights struggle. As a result, there were very few occasions when all the forces of the New Left joined together and so far these were limited to actions demanding an end to the war in Vietnam. Disillusionment in the possibility of achieving unity grows while the search for a common platform of struggle is discontinued. A number of democratic youth groups deliberately choose to put very narrow limits on their activities, concentrating them on the particular demands of one or another group.

The members of the Left radical youth and student movement often fail to grasp the profound and intrinsic relationship between the domestic and foreign policies of American imperialism. Some of them think that "wars and interventions but slightly agitate the surface of American life" and "the question of American immorality abroad will not attract the average American", therefore "all issues relevant to building a major Left constituency must be domestic, emerging from daily experienced repugnance and needs". Others, on the contrary, are convinced that the movement can be based only on the anti-war feeling of young people and come close to the conclusion that the military adventures of American imperialism have a "favorable" effect in bringing together all the forces aiming at radical changes in the existing system in the USA.

The controversy continues between the advocates of direct action in the form of demonstrations, protest meetings, pickets, etc. and those who seek to achieve change by "legal" means and engage mostly in sending petitions to Congress and working with individual senators and representatives.

Whilst conceding the need for a "radical transformation" of modern American society, most of the members of the movement proceed not from an analysis of class antagonisms, the development and intensifying of which alone can bring

about such change, but from the assumption that if a sufficient number of people were to desire a good society, sooner or later they would find a way of achieving it. This single fact reveals the weakness of their ideological stand.

At first the leaders of the Left radical students denied the need for an ideology outright. But after being involved in practical struggles, they came to the conclusion that radical changes can hardly be expected in the absence of definite ideological principles within the movement. Jacobs and Landau, who examine the New Left in their book *The New Radicals*, write: "What began perhaps as a rebellion against affluence and liberal hypocrisy grew in a few years into a radical activism that protested injustice at the very core of the society. . . . Some of the young radicals began to think about something beyond rebellion or radical protest. The movement now is struggling to develop an ideology that will guide them toward building an organization that can compete for political power."

The process of working out an ideology proved extremely difficult. The young American radicals discovered intellectual Europe. They have become interested in certain Marxist ideas, Utopian socialism, Rousseau, Camus, Sartre, the Narodniks (Russian populists), anarchists and others. They try to implement these ideas as soon as they hear of them and without properly understanding them.

The bourgeoisie and various opportunists seek to take advantage of the doubts, vacillations and inconsistencies of the New Left, and to spread anti-communism in their ranks.

Realizing the futility of crude straightforward anti-communism in modern conditions, bourgeois ideology and propaganda resort to new methods of influencing the minds of students and young intellectuals who are becoming politicized. Taking advantage of the fact that membership of the New Left involves no set criteria, they try to make out that it consists chiefly of those groups of youth who adopt ultra-Leftist and anarchist positions or whose protest assumes anti-social and immoral forms, in particular the Maoists, Trotskyists, hippies and Yippies. In this way, they intend to discredit the entire New Left.

The bourgeoisie also make use of some students' inclination towards "uncontrolled spontaneity", an extreme ultra-revolu-

tionary stance, the rebellion of the individual who does not have to know what he is fighting for and what social changes should take place as a result of the struggle. What are the reasons for such ultra-revolutionary tendencies? A number of objective and subjective causes lie at their root.

The confusion American students feel about many issues can be traced to their social origin and uncertain class affiliation. They lack experience of practical revolutionary work, and a clear idea of the class struggle; often they are unwilling and unprepared to wage a long and difficult struggle for the interests of the working people against such a strong opponent as US state-monopoly capitalism. Because of this lack of theoretical knowledge and revolutionary experience many students, finding themselves in conditions unusual for people from their background, seek to change the society that rejects them at one blow. They begin to look for a way out of this peculiar social, economic, political and psychological impasse; given the actual conditions, the prevailing level of political consciousness and almost complete lack of experience in revolutionary work, it is only natural that they are attracted by "Left" opportunist ideas. These are upheld by the students who interpret Student Power not as the demand for those social and political rights which would give students the opportunity of becoming full-fledged citizens with complete responsibility for their actions and the affairs of both university and society, but as the winning of political and state power by students following the example of the "Great Cultural Revolution" in China; they exaggerate the demand for academic freedom to such an extent that even the authority of science is denied. Their demands for the exclusive right of students to select teachers, to change the educational process at any point, and so forth, would in fact bring about not the democratization of higher education but its destruction. One interesting point is that the loudest and most "revolutionary" students are often those who only the day before were on the right wing of the student movement. They have now even taken an interest in Marxism, though not with the intention of preparing themselves to struggle for the interests of the working people. They need at least a superficial idea of Marxism, in order to slander it from the Maoist or anarchist standpoint, to play on the difficulties which exist in



the modern international communist movement and to attempt to undermine from within the student movement which is becoming more radical.

Just as serious as the threat of ultra-Left anti-communism is that of the doctrines which exploit the ideological weakness of the New Left in order to revise or distort the main tenets of Marxism-Leninism.

The most famous exponent of such ideas is Herbert Marcuse, who is falsely made out to be the chief ideologist of the New Left, responsible for the spread of student avant-gardism in the movement.

It is true that the New Left is attracted to authors who, though they criticize individual aspects of modern American capitalism, nevertheless avoid the problem of class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and underestimate or deny altogether the role of the working class as the main motive force in the transformation of society. In addition these authors attach too much importance to student avant-gardist moods, maintaining that the students on a par with other sections of the population are the principal force capable of making radical changes in modern capitalism. But Marcuse is hardly the most prominent of such New Left ideologists.

In 1960 C. Wright Mills published in the British *New Left Review* his "Letter to the New Left". Disagreeing with Daniel Bell, who coined the "end of ideology" phrase to show that students were no longer concerned with politics, Mills advanced the hypothesis that in the developed capitalist countries of the West the intellectuals may become an "immediate radical agency for change".

"Who is it that is getting fed up?" he wrote. "Who is it that is getting disgusted with what Marx called 'all the old crap'? All over the world ... the answer's the same: it is the young intelligentsia." In the same letter he also said that he could not understand the New Left writers who regarded "the working class" of the advanced capitalist societies as the historic agency, or even as the most important agency, in the face of the really impressive historical evidence that now stands against this expectation". The ideas that Mills advanced in the controversy were taken by some of the members of the New Left as positive facts. Ignoring all the other works by the same Mills, they started to look for confirma-

tion of the theory of the leading revolutionary role of the intellectuals in the theories of other sociologists. Among others they turned to the works of Marcuse who writes that the working class, manipulated by and tied to the consumer system, is no longer able to play a revolutionary role. Marcuse's theory starts off with the belief that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are still the two basic classes in the capitalist world. "However," Marcuse writes in *One Dimensional Man*, "the capitalist development has altered the structure and function of these two classes in such a way that they no longer appear to be agents of historical transformation. An overriding interest in the preservation and improvement of the institutional status quo unites the former antagonists in the most advanced areas of contemporary society." But Marcuse does not deny that one of the alternatives may be the existence of forces that would overcome modern industrial society and its tendency to hinder social development and would effect revolutionary change. This force could be people "in need of changing their way of life". Yet Marcuse does not point to the actual social forces that would bring about revolutionary change.

This is done by several other writers who have assumed the role of theoreticians of the New Left.

Lee Baxandall, who at one time was editor of the magazine that was published until the mid-sixties, *Studies on the Left*, puts the entire working class, including the unemployed, in the category of working-class aristocracy, and comes to the conclusion that not only is it impossible for the workers of the USA to become part of the New Left in the near future, but also that the existing system could "buy them off readily" or control them "at any point when the threat grows significant". Baxandall does not even consider it feasible to attract (to the New Left) even those sections of the working people that are materially deprived, as "at a certain point the belly question will poison their consciousness". He suggests waiting until the working people "will have had enough of affluence without dignity or freedom as human beings".

Baxandall also believes that the inhabitants of the ghettos, because of their economic situation, are incapable of raising their political consciousness to a level that would make them part of the New Left.

On the basis of such analysis he comes to the conclusion that "the socialist will find few durable allies among those motivated by material misery", that in general he has "no major allies", and that the only real force which can effect "radical change" in the USA towards "participatory democracy" are the "college students", certain groups of creative intellectuals, "the independent wealthy" and other insignificant sections of the population.

Such views are also held by some of the so-called liberals among American sociologists who maintain that youth has replaced the proletariat in the system of capitalist relations of production. The aim of such pseudo-academic ideas put forward by the "false friends of youth" is to draw its radical elements away from the working class, to prevent their adherence to the class positions of the proletariat and sow doubts as to the validity of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

All those who aim at becoming theoreticians of the New Left to some extent try to win over the Left radical youth and students by flattering them. Realizing in their turn the futility of resisting the growing political activism of the students, certain bourgeois sociologists, propagandists, statesmen and politicians strive by the same means of flattery and praise to direct the rebellious spirit of protest among the young onto the road of reformism within capitalist society. As if with one voice they argue against "violent actions" on the part of the students, express their understanding of the students' desire to find a meaningful place in modern bourgeois society, and distinguish between the leadership of the New Left organizations and their rank and file.

A good example of this is the memorandum on the New Left in the USA drawn up by a senate committee and the fawning tone of its recommendations. One of these reads: "With few exceptions, the leaders are probably beyond redemption. But there is no reason to write off the scores of thousands of innocent and idealistic young people whom the leaders of the New Left now have in tow. There is, on the contrary, every reason to hope that an understanding and sympathetic approach will assist these thousands of earnest young people who today consider themselves part of the New Left to overcome their hostility to society and to devote their talents to the task of building and perfecting rather

than to the senseless task of tearing down and destroying."

In a similar spirit, Yale University professor of psychiatry Kenneth Keniston courts the American youth and students of the protest movement in his book *Young Radicals*. He even argues for the adoption by the Establishment of an understanding approach to the young radicals on the grounds that their rebellion is not dangerous for the bourgeoisie as long as they act separately and without either a long-term platform or clearly defined aims. The main thing is not to allow an alliance of the Left radical youth and students with the organized working-class movement and the Communist Party! For this end, professor Keniston proposes to cultivate among young radicals an interest in the process and not the programme, in continuous movement without continuous aims. In other words Keniston is out to revive the old opportunist maxim—the movement is everything, the final end is nothing—in order to direct the revolutionary movement onto reformist lines.

Thus, sociologists claiming to be New Left ideologists try to present young people as the only revolutionary force, while the bourgeoisie offers youth the idea that they are the only force capable, in some abstract future, of effecting reforms which can supposedly rid capitalist society of all its evils.

Both theories are anti-communist in content and captured the attention of bourgeois politicians and ideologists when considerable sections of American youth, particularly in the New Left, had more and more definitely turned away from anti-communism.

The senate committee memorandum mentioned above repeatedly complains that "anti-communism is becoming a 'dirty word' on the college campus" and that "the Communists have been able, with considerable success, to use the New Left movement for their own purpose". They are troubled by the fact that among members of the New Left "America is frequently compared with Nazi Germany" and communism is regarded as a more hopeful system than capitalism.

The memorandum concludes: "There is no longer within the New Left a sizable group of individuals who will affirm that communism is totalitarian, as did the SDS in their founding document."



## CHOOSING THE ROAD

The rise and development of a radical youth movement, the New Left, contributes to the downfall of anti-communism as a policy capable of influencing large numbers of the population in the USA. The finest members of the Left radical youth and student movement are coming to scientific socialism in their own specific way.

In his time Lenin expressed the thought that youth "must of necessity advance to socialism *in a different way, by other paths, in other forms, in other circumstances* than their fathers".

Proceeding from this methodological premise of Lenin's, we may speak of the specific way in which certain groups of American students in the New Left advance towards socialism.

Students join the democratic struggle in particular conditions. They comprise a considerably large and constantly growing section of the population and yet they are not a separate class; the student body as a whole lacks common economic, social, political and even professional interests. The majority of students do not experience the kind of material hardships which would bring them face to face with the need for a radical restructuring of modern capitalist society.

Students do not as yet take a direct part in the productive process. Despite the fact that a growing number of students are forced to combine study with work, and are subject to some form of capitalist exploitation, the latter still seems abstract to them. Yet beyond this abstraction students begin to discern the outlines of the real situation they will face after graduation. Some of its aspects are already made felt at college, in particular the indifference towards students on the part of a society which refuses to solve the problems of the university; the nature of the educational process, tailored to meet the specific requirements of the monopolies; and restriction of the freedom of the individual, of opportunities for the development of individual faculties, etc. The student feels alienated and irrelevant to the society he wishes to take part in, and therefore strives to overcome this alienation. While still not realizing that the main source of his alienation in society is the system of state-monopoly capi-

talism, the students nevertheless are protesting against it, whether they call it the power structure, the Establishment or any other term. However, in the initial stage this criticism of capitalism is of an individual nature since it stems from the harmful influence of capitalism on individuals and their interrelationships. When the New Left first arose its members placed greatest emphasis on the alienation of the individual and not on the exploited class. As Don Hammerquist wrote in *Political Affairs*, "usually, this is not the alienated individual of Marxist theory, whose alienation stems from the nature of the work-process under capitalism. Instead, it is closer to the alienated individual of the existentialists— isolated, 'lonely', condemned to total responsibility for his actions, defenseless and essentially powerless in his 'absurd' struggle with the forces which oppress him."

It is not without significance that the existentialism of Sartre continues to be one of the most popular theories in the New Left. Nevertheless, even an existentialist understanding of the alienation of the individual leads to thoughts on the invalidity of a system which does not leave room for the particular individual and the need for its destruction and replacement by something new. At first the New Left sought to construct its own original model of a hitherto unknown social system, but nothing came of these efforts except for eclectic compilations drawn from the doctrines of various Utopians, Narodniks, ideologists of the French bourgeois revolution, existentialists and others. The natural way out of this impasse is to be found only in the theory of scientific socialism. With the overcoming of the remaining anti-communist elements the members of the Left radical youth and student movement have become more and more interested in this theory. But their predominantly petty-bourgeois class origin, and prejudice towards the concept of the alienated individual, prevent them from immediately mastering the theory of scientific socialism. They show interest in only one aspect of the problem, i.e., the unlimited opportunities which socialism opens for the development of the individual, for democracy and freedom. Initially, they completely discard the issues concerned with the achieving of socialism—the class struggle, socialist revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat. It is this that lies behind their distrustful attitude towards the Communist Party. But experience shows that

with the growing participation of students in the struggle for social, economic and political demands the democratic wing of the New Left is overcoming its ideological and theoretical shortsightedness and political inconsistency, though not without various deviations, doubts and vacillations.

In a number of cases, there has been a certain pressure towards a shift from eclectic ideological views to a Marxist-Leninist stand. As Jacobs and Landau write, in the initial stage of the movement's development its members regarded the Marxists-Leninists "as no more than leftovers from the thirties". But "with the widening interest of youth in civil rights, civil liberties, and peace issues, the older versions of Marxism began to have a new appeal". Interest in the theory of the class struggle of the proletariat and in scientific socialism is growing even more with the discovery by the New Left of such social phenomena as the tendency for the middle strata to turn into a directly exploited mass, as they are forced into the ranks of the proletariat, and of the drawing closer of the position of a large part of the intellectuals with that of the working class, as the political and social oppression of the intelligentsia by state-monopoly capitalism increases. The director of the American Institute of Marxist Studies, Herbert Aptheker has written: "Not in thirty years has there been so serious, deep, and widespread an interest in Marxism and in socialism as there is now in the colleges, universities, and scholarly organizations and professions in the United States."

The former president of Students for a Democratic Society, Carl Oglesby, who in 1966 had denied any "schemes or isms" and called for a struggle only for simple human decency, in 1969 openly declared that there was no other comprehensive philosophy of revolutionary action besides Marxism.

Bourgeois academics studying the New Left admit that a considerable part of the movement has been influenced by Marxism-Leninism. The senate committee memorandum notes that a part of the New Left in the USA is clearly Marxist.

Direct participation in the struggle also helps overcome the student avant-gardism shown by a part of the student movement in such ways as their tendency to overestimate

their revolutionary role and potential, in their theoretical vacillations and inconsistency, and in their lack of political maturity and first-hand experience of the revolutionary struggle. But even while taking action for academic demands, such as the reform and democratization of education, students have the opportunity to see for themselves that, as Lenin wrote, success can be secured only with "the support of the people, especially of the workers". Through such action they come to realize that alone they are unable to achieve not only major social change but even immediate success over academic demands.

A reappraisal of the relative significance of the motive forces for radical change in society is taking place within the ranks of the Left radical youth and student movement, and their attitude to the working class is altering. A growing number of young radicals now regard it as the main force in the struggle for democracy.

In June 1966 the 18th National Convention of the Communist Party pointed to these shifts as an important factor in the development of the American New Left.

In the early sixties, the convention noted, a majority of the members of this movement reckoned that if radical changes were to take place in society, their main agency would be the students and young intellectuals. This concept was altered with the rise of the civil rights movement, and the growing recognition of the Negro population as a force capable of effecting social change. The direct participation of the members of the Left youth organizations in the civil rights struggle led them to reassess the roles of various groups of the population and to define the poor Negro population as the most militant force in the country. However, a series of strikes, especially the miners' strike in the Appalachian Mountains, provided dramatic evidence of the plight of the poverty-stricken white population and their determination to wage a resolute struggle. Subsequently, the members of the New Left began to regard the poor white people as a force capable of taking part in the struggle for radical social change.

When they first began to act, the members of the New Left tended to place all the blame for the ills of modern American society on an abstract "power structure" or on bureaucratism as a thing in itself. State-monopoly capitalism,



or the corporate world as it was called, was regarded as merely another obstacle in the way of social progress. However, as time went on more and more radicals came to see state-monopoly capitalism as the main obstacle.

This inevitably brought about a strengthening of the anti-monopoly trend in the New Left, and with it an understanding of the fact that it was impossible to put an end to the domination of monopolies without the support of the working class.

There followed a number of cases in the USA of progressive students lending support to the struggle of the working people or directly participating in workers' strikes. As early as 1965, students of the University of California actively supported a strike of agricultural workers, mostly Mexican-Americans. The struggle of the agricultural workers of California for their rights is still going on and continues to draw the support of progressive American students and youth, now not only those at the University of California but of also the young members of progressive organizations in many parts of the country.

In the summer of 1968 the Chicago Students for a Democratic Society took part in a strike, banned by the labor union, of a group of truck drivers, headed by Negroes from the Railway Express Agency. SDS members picketed with placards reading "Students Support REA Strikers", argued with the white workers to stop being strikebreakers and join the strike, and organized debates in which they convinced workers of all colors that their common enemy was the employers. At the same time students in Los Angeles joined with workers in defiance of a ban by labor union leaders to block the offices of the *Los Angeles Herald Examiner* whose workers were on strike. SDS members contributed to the setting up of a labor union of medical personnel at a hospital in New York University. Much help was given by New York students to the victorious strike of 800 workers in the garment industry by such means as agitating among the members of other labor unions, and collecting money to support the strikers. In all they distributed over 40 thousand leaflets, and every morning at seven o'clock 50 to 60 students came to the garment factory to picket with the workers. With the help of the students, both Negroes and Latin American workers, men and women, acted together as a single front.

The attempts of the employers and the corrupt labor union bosses to split the strikers this time met no success.

Nationally syndicated anti-communist labor columnist Victor Riesel came out in strong terms against the students that supported the strike in an article entitled "SDS Spreads Revolt from Campus to Labor". With this, he provided further proof of the fear the US Establishment have of the coming together of the student and workers' movement and their desire to prevent this. As always in such cases, the campaign against the students was joined by the ultra-Leftists who ridiculed the SDS work-in as anti-revolutionary and reformist.

The number of joint strikes involving both workers and students is growing in spite of the stern measures taken by the government, the employers and the labor union leadership.

The Left radical student movement is realizing that to separate professional workers, workers in the service sphere, white-collar workers and engineers and technicians with a college degree into a "class", which is allegedly apart from industrial workers, leads only to the spreading of confusion and the splitting of millions of workers and students, which prevents them from understanding that they have both a common exploiter and common interests requiring unity in the struggle against capitalist oppression. It is becoming a more and more widespread belief in the New Left that in college, students are merely being trained to join the ranks of the working class, and this is why many radical students have set themselves the task of persuading college graduates that they are really highly skilled workers, and that it is in their interests to unite with their future co-workers, both skilled and non-skilled, in the same organizations.

However, this does not immediately lead to the recognition of the leading revolutionary role of the working class and of the need for close cooperation with the workers. Anti-communist prejudices are still prevalent, along with a distrustful view of working youth and the whole working class as an inert mass concerned only with its material well-being. But once they have recognized the leading revolutionary role of the working class young radicals quickly come to the conclusion that their former views were incorrect.

Direct contact with the working class makes the New Left ideologically and politically more mature; it leads its members to reappraise their theoretical positions, discard the doctrines dreamed up by academics, and make a deeper study of Marxism-Leninism. The validity of theories of the Marcusean type is brought into question more and more often.

An example of this is provided by SDS member Dennis Kamensky who worked for some time in the garment industry. He writes: "Herbert Marcuse, advocate of the 'New working class' theory tells us ... that 'Our society distinguishes itself by conquering the centrifugal social forces with Technology rather than Terror, on the dual basis of overwhelming efficiency and an increasing standard of living'. Many of the 400,000 workers in the garment industry live in ghettos. They get lousy wages ... and the factories are like prison camps. To say that these workers ... are conquered by an increasing standard of living just doesn't fit the facts.... The only advance in technology that affects their repression is better guns, chemicals, tanks, etc."

Another student who took part in the SDS work-in in New Jersey was even more explicit: "The SDS Work-In project has greatly improved my understanding of the strength of the US working class.... Workers are just the opposite of what our professors tell us they are.... Only they can keep production going; only they can grind production to a halt; and only they can overthrow the bosses. This summer has proven to me once and for all that workers surely aren't bought off or automated out of existence.... They have plenty of muscle and plenty of fighting spirit—but their mis-leaders have been too successful in insulating them from working-class ideology. Armed with Marxism-Leninism, workers and their allies in the US will put up a hell of a fight—and win!"

Just as complex as the process of ideological development is the political growth and progress of the Left radical student movement in the USA. Having started their activity with actions based on specific and individual demands, mostly academic, various student groups and organizations have, in the course of the struggle, gradually come to realize that the urgent problems bred by modern capitalism must be treated in their totality.

As the basis of the democratic student movement widens, there emerge the preconditions necessary for a vital shift away from the protest against the particular, individual ills of modern capitalist society to the struggle to do away with the causes of these ills. This shift is not an easy one and is accompanied by numerous vacillations. Many of the members of the New Left stop dead in their tracks, unable to advance beyond demands for reform within the capitalist system and occupy a revolutionary stand of struggle for the replacement of the capitalist system. They find themselves in the position of people who see the source of evil in the system, but are not yet ready to take up the struggle for the complete liquidation of the system.

This is the dividing line between those who adhere to revolutionary views and those who advocate reformism. The young Leftists that have crossed it become fighters for socialism. A great majority of the members of the New Left are not yet able to cross over.

On January 27, 1973, agreements were signed in Paris on the cessation of war and the restoration of peace in Vietnam. This is an important landmark in the peoples' struggle for freedom, national sovereignty, universal peace, and social progress, and is a triumph for the militant solidarity of progressive, peace-loving forces in which the younger generation took an active part.

#### WITH YOUTH AND FOR YOUTH

In a speech at the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party Lenin put forward the task of defending young fighters from the "false friends" who distracted them from "a thorough revolutionary training through recourse to empty revolutionary or idealistic phrase-mongering". In modern America this task is discharged with honor and consistency by its Communist Party. The following words from the main document of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties apply in full measure to the American Communist Party. The Communists propagate in the ranks of the youth movement "the ideas of scientific socialism, explaining the danger of various pseudo-revolutionary ideas, which could influence young people, and



seeking to help young people find the right path in the struggle against imperialism and for defence of their interests", and introduce into the Left radical youth and student movement awareness of the fact that "only close unity with the working-class movement and its Communist vanguard can open for them truly revolutionary prospects".

The rise of the Left radical youth and student movement took place at a difficult time for the Communist Party, USA. Throughout the fifties members of the party suffered from harsh persecution by the police, and many prominent party leaders were in prison. An opportunist group had grown up inside the party, which was in effect seeking its destruction.

In the middle of hard struggle for its very existence in semi-legal conditions, the party nevertheless noticed and correctly appraised the first stirrings of protest among young people and their potential for involving the mass of the new generation in democratic movements. As early as 1959 at the 17th National Convention the need to intensify work among young people was made plain. The resolution on the youth question read: "To work among youth is to work for the future. The present generation of youth ... is ... the base of the Party of the future. Without full attention to its needs and development, therefore, the Party jeopardizes its own existence as an effective vanguard. Youth work must be placed next to work in the labor and Negro people's movements as a major area of mass work."

Further on individual Communists were criticized for noticing only the superficial aspects of the youth protest movement, especially its attitude of denying everything and rebelling against everything. They misunderstood the causes of the rebellion among young people, explained it by the violent nature of the new generation. The Communist Party not only revealed these mistakes but also urged American Communists to start as soon as possible explaining to young people the meaning of the events in which they were caught up, adding that they should not resist the new elements brought by youth into all the spheres of struggle and life but instead use them as a means of raising the political awareness of young people and directing their efforts into the proper political channel.

The Communist Party did not fail to take into account the fact that the upsurge in the youth movement was generally spontaneous and unorganized, and that the majority of its members had no conception of class struggle, but based their protest on individual dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the social and political order of American society.

Working among young people involved in the protest movement, the party at first did not confront them with socialist slogans but, proceeding from the principle laid down in its program that the American road to socialism lies in democratic struggle, tried to secure a mass basis for the existing democratic movements, in particular the anti-war and civil rights movements. With the aim of involving new groups of young people in these movements, the American Communists realized that to begin with they would have to employ simple methods of struggle which young people would regard as their own and not as forced upon them from without. Therefore, whilst not slackening their interest in the active protest movement against aggression in Vietnam and for the withdrawal of all American troops from Southeast Asia, the Communist Party was constantly spreading propaganda among young people on the issue of the draft, since it has a direct bearing upon the lives of millions of young Americans not active in the democratic movements. It is in the range of slogans and forms to which the anti-war movement gave rise that the American Communists saw the means of widening it to involve the masses.

In a special resolution on questions of the peace movement adopted by the Communist Party in 1967, it was clearly stated that any attempt to retain the movement in a single form would destroy its representative nature, its spontaneity and the creative element which are all so essential in a people's struggle. In the same year, at a National Committee meeting Gus Hall emphasized that when there was a basic community of self-interests, and when diversity of forms and organizations was approached with the concept of strengthening the unity of the overall forces of progress, then such diversity served a useful purpose. This policy of the Communist Party is consistently implemented in life. Its members, as was stated in a declaration concerning the anti-war moratorium in November 1969, were, are, and will be active participants and supporters of any movement demanding an end

to policies of imperialist aggression. Communists are open about the fact that by taking part in the anti-war movement they are hoping to bring into it their particular ideology and to raise the political consciousness of its members. They patiently explain to young people that militarism is an instrument of class oppression, that in addition to the struggle against imperialism they must develop a strong movement against monopoly capitalism, and that young people have a great deal to contribute to such a movement.

The Communist Party also pays a lot of attention to explaining to the young members of the democratic movements the intrinsic relationship between various issues of the domestic and foreign policy of American imperialism. In particular, it points out the connection between the struggle for peace and the civil rights movement, explaining that oppression of the blacks and racial discrimination remain as before fundamental to the rule of monopoly capitalism in whose interests the war in Vietnam was waged. By referring to actual events, the Communists are able to show that the war is used by the government, monopoly capitalism and reactionary forces to encourage white chauvinism, as an excuse to go back on the reforms that have already been won, and to worsen the economic situation for both black and white youth and widen the gap between them. The Communist Party is firm in resisting such actions on the part of the government and the reaction and in fighting for unity among the young people involved in the democratic movements and divided only by the color of their skin. It took an active part in the Chicago National Conference for New Politics in September 1967, where it consistently advocated the need for unity of the white and black races, particularly in the working class, as a foremost and essential condition for effecting radical social changes in the USA. The Communists made a significant contribution to the general conference of the Black Panther Party held in Oakland (California) in the summer of 1969 under the slogan of resistance to reaction and racism. The conference saw the start of a new stage in the development of united action among the truly revolutionary forces of America regardless of differences in race or age.

The mass influx into the democratic movement of people drawn from the petty-bourgeois middle class and lacking

any tradition of class struggle has inevitably led to confusion on a number of ideological and political issues. This is reflected in the failure to understand the leading revolutionary role of the working class, in the spreading of the theory of so-called "student avant-gardism", and in revolutionary phrase-mongering and attempts to play off against each other the young and the old generations fighting against the system in the country.

The Communist Party bases its special approach to the mistakes and confusion among young radicals on Lenin's proposition that the lack of theoretical clarity and firmness in youth is a passing phenomenon caused by the fervor of the revolutionary impulse and the desire to find the solution of major social and political problems as quickly as possible. It realizes that rebellion of young people is in fact a search for ways of transforming their society and way of life, and with it the social and economic system which not only deprives them of economic opportunities and democratic rights and freedoms, but forces them to take part in aggressive wars.

With this in mind the Communists make special efforts to explain to young radicals that their views are mistaken, especially on the role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle. They constantly emphasize that the future development of the democratic movements in modern America, their struggle against the monopolies and their success in achieving their aims, very largely depend on the extent to which the working class, and in particular young workers, participate in the movement. Gus Hall has written: "All subsequent developments in the struggle for peace, for civil rights, as well as in the youth upsurge, will in a critical measure be determined by what the working class will do, how it will react to the coming events. We are dealing here with one of the most fundamental laws of social development under capitalism. The position of the working class does not necessarily determine how struggles and movements will start. But it does determine how far they will develop, how much and how lasting gains will be, and above all, what the political content of the victories will be."

American Communists give priority to their work among young workers with the aim of encouraging them to play the most important part in the mass democratic movements. This is not simply because their numbers make them the largest



group of young people, but because due to their class position and the fact that they are the main source of profit for the monopolies, their participation in the democratic movements is the most effective way of turning them against the monopolies and against capitalism.

The Communist Party always stresses the importance of the interrelation between the struggle for ultimate revolutionary aims and for such urgent demands of the day as higher wages, and shorter working hours; the equality of workers irrespective of the color of their skin, their age or their sex; and attention to problems arising from the stepping up of production, automation, unemployment, etc. These are the problems which above all concern working-class youth, and this is why, to quote Henry Winston, Chairman of the Communist Party, USA, members of the democratic movements of non-working-class origin, i.e., from the middle classes, must come "to understand the indispensability of the struggle for immediate demands if they wish to achieve socialism. Socialism is possible of achievement only to the degree that the working class first of all is convinced of its need."

The struggle for current demands is also important because it exposes the role of the monopolies as the main cause of the crisis in modern American society. Through carrying on the struggle for immediate demands the members of the democratic movements more quickly come to realize that they must launch consistent action against the domination of the monopolies.

The Communists also help further the unity of those opposed to the monopolies by explaining that the division of the older and younger generation, of the so-called old Left and New Left, is totally false. Only the government and the forces of reaction can gain from this division by using it as a means of splitting various sectors of the revolutionary and democratic movements. The Communists are for the unity of young and old activists. The most reliable means of ensuring this unity is involvement in the common struggle for social progress and, to a greater degree still, in the class struggle. "Marxism as the science of this struggle," declares Gus Hall, "provides the two-way street through which the contributions of both the young and the old can come into play. Our Party is living proof of that unity."

Whilst patiently working to overcome the mistakes and misconceptions of the young radicals, the Communist Party nevertheless firmly opposes any attempt to distort Marxism-Leninism and lead young people away from the struggle for the vital interests of the American working people. It exposes the strategies the Establishment uses in the hope of returning to the "good old times" of often violent but still "innocent" student fun and games. The Communists warn the young radicals of the danger of bourgeois liberals penetrating the democratic student organizations. Recently this has been happening more and more—the liberals are realizing that, as Gus Hall said at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, the students are not just "letting off steam", but have presented some nonnegotiable demands. However, while the liberals attempt to pander to the students in the protest movement, and by praising them to lead them onto the road of reformism, the Communists unequivocally state that student protest is the struggle for change in the foundations of capitalist society. They therefore support the students' claims for higher learning to be recognized as the inalienable right of all youth and made a real possibility for all; for the abandoning of racial restrictions in the showcase integration in all colleges and universities; and for ending all connections between educational establishments and the military-industrial complex.

Communists resolutely expose the essentially petty-bourgeois nature of all kinds of ultra-revolutionary anarchists, Trotskyists and Maoists who join with the frenzied reactionaries in preaching anti-communism. In fact, only the arch-enemies of the interests of the working people and of socialism—such as the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance—could go so far as to accuse the Communist Party of supporting the politicians and the liberal wing of the American capitalist class and of attempting to restrict the working-class and the civil rights movements to the politics of the Democratic Party, one of the main parties of the imperialists.

The position of the Communist Party within the Left radical youth and student movement is growing stronger from year to year in spite of rabid anti-communism, slander and distortion. More and more young Americans in the democratic movements want to hear about the communist viewpoint

not from various opportunists but from Communist Party members themselves. Sometimes the largest university assembly-halls are too small to house all the people who want to listen to a Communist Party leader and the lecture-meetings are transferred to stadiums. In the autumn of 1969, 1,200 students of the University of California called for a general strike on all the nine campuses to last until Angela Davis, the assistant professor of philosophy, was completely reinstated in the job she had lost due to her membership of the Communist Party. Later Angela Davis was arrested on a false charge of complicity to murder. Student demonstrations supporting her went on until she was finally freed.

As a result of its theoretical and practical activity the Communist Party, USA, has succeeded in breaching the wall of anti-communism, overcoming its isolation, and occupying its rightful place as the vanguard of the democratic movements of modern America. The consistency of its policy in support of the just hopes and aspirations of the young generation has contributed greatly to this. Only a few years before the average age of its members was the oldest of any party, as Gus Hall conceded, but at the 18th National Convention in 1966, 25 per cent of its members were young people of less than 23 years. It is this that led the late Edgar Hoover, a leading expert in anti-communism, to call it a convention with emphasis on youth.

Young Communists are actively working in various organizations of Left radical youth and students in the USA, demonstrating the Communist Party's genuine desire for fruitful cooperation with these organizations and not for undermining them from within, as both bourgeois and Left sectarian propagandists assert. At the same time the party does not try to conceal that its members in the democratic organizations of young people are striving to raise their militancy and spread the ideas of scientific socialism. At its 18th convention, the Communist Party, USA, resolved "to aid in every way the building of socialist-oriented youth groups without, of course, infringing on their independence". Directly after the convention, and wherever it proved possible, Communists began to set up local Marxist youth circles, Marxist debating clubs and similar groups in colleges and universities.

In view of the favorable conditions for spreading Marxist-Leninist ideology among American youth and for encouraging their active participation in all the progressive and democratic movements, the 19th National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, held in May 1969 adopted the resolution to revive the national Marxist-Leninist youth organization. The relevant documents stated that such an organization must be based on primarily working-class youth, must aim for the unity of blacks and whites in the struggle against racism, must concentrate its efforts on achieving unity of democratic forces of youth, and, proceeding from the principles of class struggle, must strive for the establishment of socialism through the transfer of state power into the hands of the working class. It must be a Marxist-Leninist youth organization closely associated with the Communist Party, an organization which upholds the leading role of the Communist Party among young people, and in order to be most effective its public activities must be closely linked to the participation of its members in the work of other youth organizations and movements. Just such an organization was founded in February 1970—the Young Workers Liberation League.



Alexander Brychkov, C. Sc. (Hist.), senior research worker at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences, is the author of scholarly works and essays dealing with problems of the international youth and student movement.

For three years Brychkov was a member of the editorial board of *World Student News*, published by the International Union of Students; in 1963 and 1964 he was Executive Secretary of the USSR Student Council and has since then taken part in many international and national student and youth forums.

The present book by Brychkov put out by Molodaya Gvardiya Publishers in 1971 is the fruit of his long-standing research, primarily his candidate's thesis presented in 1968, "The Democratic Trends in American Youth in 1960-67", and personal observations, meetings and conversations during his travels across the United States in the winter of 1969 and the summer of 1970. The author combines scholarly analysis, first-hand knowledge of the youth and student movement and a journalistic style.



Imported by  
**IMPORTED  
PUBLICATIONS, INC.**  
320 West Ohio Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
Phone 312/787-9017